

“A Norwegian speaks Norwegian”

An analysis of categorization and identity construction in narratives of Latin American migrants in Oslo

Verónica Pájaro



MA Thesis in Linguistics
Department of Linguistic and Scandinavian studies

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

May 2011

© Verónica Pájaro

2011

Categorization as an identity construction strategy

Verónica Pájaro

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Summary

This project seeks to trace how Latin American migrants residing in Oslo use group categories for self- and other-identification for the negotiation and construction of identities in interaction. Identity construction is an essential process for migration and resettlement, as the relocation of the self in a new context requires a constant process of redefinition of the self in relation to the new environment and community.

I consider group categorization labels such as “foreigner,” “Norwegian,” etc., to function as discourse strategies by which participants are able to index social relations and situations that exceed the actual interactional situation of the interview, following De Fina’s (2003; 2006) analytical model of identity construction in interaction. Categories also function as resources for stance-taking (Jaffe 2009), by which the participants position themselves in relation to the implicit meanings of the categories, thus negotiating and constructing individual identities, which are non-reducible to single categorization labels. The goals of this thesis are to study how categorization functions as an identity construction strategy in narratives of personal experience, and to trace the schematic meanings of category labels that are implicit in the narrative sequences that thus function as a resource for the interactional construction of situated individual identities.

In order to achieve these goals, I use a discourse analytic approach to categorization in narrative that can account for the functioning of categorization in the narratives and for socially shared, presupposed meanings of categories. I do a qualitative analysis of the narratives elicited in a focus group interview with three highly educated Spanish speaking immigrants from three different countries in Latin America.

Keywords: Categorization, identity construction, migration, Linguistics, Interactional Sociolinguistics, MCD, Narrative Analysis, Latin America, Spanish, Oslo

Preface

This thesis project was developed with a grant from, and as part of the interdisciplinary research project SKI “Language, culture and identity in migrant narratives” founded by the Norwegian Research Council (2008-2012), at the University of Oslo. To the researchers and fellow students in the project: thank you for all your support and feedback during the entire process of this thesis.

I must also thank the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, and the Master’s program for linguistics at the University of Oslo for the travel grants I was assigned to attend conferences during the writing process. The possibility of presenting my work to a larger, international audience has been invaluable to my project.

To my supervisors, Elizabeth Lanza and Bjørghild Kjelsvik, who have exceeded their obligations during the guiding process: Thank you so much for your constant encouragement, support and constructive criticism, without which this thesis would have been less concise and much, much longer.

The final writing process would have been overwhelmingly hard, had it not been for the fantastic people at the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies. To all of my fellow students with whom I shared lunches and long working hours at the *lesesalen*: I will miss you! To the research fellows and Professors that showed interest in my project, thank you for your support. And to the administrative personnel that make sure that things actually get done, a big thank you as well.

This project would not have been possible without the generosity and engagement of *Juana*, *Victor* and *Susana*. Thank you for sharing your experiences and points of view with me.

Y finalmente, a mis varones, sin los cuales nada de esto tiene sentido ni gracia.

Verónica Pájaro, Oslo, May 2011

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Migration to Norway	3
1.2	Why Latin Americans?.....	4
1.3	Conclusion.....	5
2	Theoretical background.....	7
2.1	Narrative and Identities	7
2.2	Identity and categorization in conversation and discourse.....	9
2.2.1	Conversation Analysis and Member Categorization Devices.....	10
2.2.2	Membership Categorization Analysis	11
2.2.3	Categorization in narrative and identity analysis	12
2.3	Discourse and narrative analysis	17
2.3.1	The canonical narrative: Labov	18
2.3.2	Contemporary approaches to narrative analysis.....	19
2.3.3	Categorization in narrative	21
2.4	Conclusion.....	23
3	Methodology and data.....	25
3.1	Which Latin Americans?.....	25
3.2	The participants	26
3.3	Data collection: the interview	28
3.4	Script questions	30
3.5	Transcription	30
3.6	Some ethical considerations	31
3.7	The researcher as an insider	32
3.8	The corpus of narratives for the analysis	34
3.9	Conclusion.....	38
4	Analysis	39
4.1	The job interview narratives.....	41
4.1.1	Victor B	41
4.1.2	Susana B	55
4.1.3	Victor C	63
4.1.4	Discussion and conclusion for the analyses of job interview narratives.....	66

4.2	The institutional and service encounters narratives	68
4.2.1	Juana A.....	68
4.2.2	Victor A.....	73
4.2.3	Susana A.....	84
4.2.4	Juana B	88
4.2.5	Discussion and conclusion for the analyses of institutional and service encounters narratives	95
5	Discussion and conclusion	97
5.1	<i>Noruegos</i> and <i>extranjeros</i>	97
5.2	Ethnic categories?	101
5.3	Language conflict narratives?	104
5.4	Concluding remarks	105
	References	111
	Appendix A	118
	Appendix B	138
	Appendix C	139
	Appendix D	140
	Table 1: Narrative dimensions	20
	Table 2: Narratives distributed according to participant.....	35
	Table 3: Distribution of narrative types according to narrator.....	36
	Table 4: Corpus of narratives by title and type	37
	Table 5: Occurrences of category labels in the interview and corpus.....	97

Detailed discourse analysis is like a magnifying glass in that it illuminates the way linguistic items and strategies employed by individuals are part of a repertory of resources shared by communities. It is through the study of situated discourse instances that cultural and social meanings become apparent to the analyst. (De Fina 2003: 5-6)

1 Introduction

During the past ten years, Norway received its highest immigration inflows in history (SSB 2011b). Most of the new migration groups have settled in Oslo, the capital city and the largest in the country, producing a fast change in the composition of the population by introducing a multiplicity of new languages and cultures into the urban landscape. This has created new arenas for transcultural contact and new possibilities for the negotiation and emergence of various identities. Identity construction is an essential process for migration and resettlement, as the relocation of the self in a new context requires a constant process of redefinition of the self in relation to the new environment and community.

The available social research on migration often focuses on statistical markers that inform us of the tendencies in the development of migration, with regard to the largest immigration groups. Qualitative analytic approaches to migration complement this type of data, since focusing on immigrants' experiences and evaluations of their own migration processes can provide understanding of the individual realities that shape the larger, quantifiable trends. The present thesis takes such a qualitative analytical perspective on migration processes by analyzing the formulation of the migration experiences of a small, rather understudied group: Spanish-speaking Latin Americans residing in Oslo.

This project seeks to trace how participants construct their identities by resorting to group membership categories in narratives of personal experience as immigrants in Norway. In order to achieve this goal, I use an interactional sociolinguistic approach to categorization in narrative that can provide insights into the functioning of self and other categorizations in the story worlds of the narratives, and into the socially shared, presupposed meanings of categories that sustain categorization processes (De Fina 2003). I will consider how social category labels such as "foreigner," "Latino," "Norwegian," etc., function as discourse strategies through which participants are able to refer to characters in the narratives as member of social groups. Categories can also function as resources for stance-taking (Jaffe 2009), by which the participants position themselves in relation to the stereotypical meanings implied in the categories, thus negotiating and constructing individual identities which are non-reducible to single category labels.

The analysis focuses on the narratives elicited in a focus group interview with three participants. I take as a point of departure the assumption that the elaboration of personal experience in narrative is a sense-making process through which people assign meaning to their past experiences and construct an image of their self (Ochs and Capps 2001). Narrative can thus be central to the process of identity construction in cases of migration. I make use of the analytical tools of different approaches to discourse, such as narrative and conversation analysis, though I place the analyses within the general frames of interactional sociolinguistics. This sub-discipline introduces contextual information in the analysis of concrete instances of interaction, whether the context is indexed or referred to by the participants or not (Schiffrin 1994). In this sense, such an approach gives the best analytical tools for an analysis that conceives of categorization as something not only negotiated in interaction, but also partially conventionalized in the stereotypical meanings of categories.

The research questions of the project are the following:

- How do participants construct individual identities in interaction through the use of group categories in narratives of personal experience?
 - Which categories and category labels do Latin Americans use to refer to themselves and others in narratives of personal experience?
 - Which presupposed, shared meanings are assigned to the categories used in the narratives?
 - How do participants position themselves in relation to the categorizations presented in the narratives?

Before answering these questions, I present relevant background information on the general phenomenon of migration in Norway, on the characteristics of Latin American migration, and argue for the selection of the group that is in the focus of this project.

1.1 Migration to Norway

According to the Statistics Norway (SSB), 12.2 percent of the Norwegian population of 4.9 million inhabitants are immigrants¹ (SSB 2011c). In Oslo, 28 percent of the population has an immigrant background, thus presenting the highest density of immigrant population in the country. An intensified contact situation with immigrants reportedly leads to a more positive attitude towards immigration and immigrants on behalf of the Norwegian population (IMDi 2010a), so Oslo can be considered among the regions where the local population is more open and positive towards immigrants. Nevertheless, 50 percent of the Norwegian population in general, do consider that the integration of immigrants is not working well, while 12 percent considers that it has failed completely. Though the percentage of people that think that the immigration project failed is rather low, it nevertheless had a 100 percent increase for the four year period 2005-2009, which indicates that immigration has become a problematic topic in Norwegian society. While more people expressed tolerance towards ethnic and cultural diversity, they also indicated more skepticism towards immigrants in matters such as immigration restrictions and integration challenges (All facts from IMDi 2010a).

From a historical perspective, receiving large waves of immigration is a relatively new phenomenon in Norway. Until the 1960s, Norway was an emigration country (Liebig 2009), due to its precarious economic situation that pushed a large part of the Norwegians, like many other Europeans, into emigration in search of a better life. This situation has changed dramatically during the past fifty years, after the discovery of oil in the North Sea. The state has become rich from oil revenues, which in combination with a strong welfare model contributed to Norway becoming the country with the highest living standard in the world (UNDP 2010). Norway has now turned into an immigration country, which in the lapse of the past ten years received its historically highest number of immigrants (SSB 2011b), both work-related and through refugee admission quotas, which also constitute among the highest immigration rates for Europe . This acceleration in the growth of immigration is causing a rapid change in the social and cultural landscape of the country; migration and integration issues are thus controversial topics

¹ Statistics Norway gathers into one group both first generation immigrants and their Norwegian born children with two foreign parents, when presenting statistics.

that generate engagement in the population, as it is often thematized in political and media discourses (IMDi 2010b).

In this thesis I work with a rather little represented group, Spanish-speaking Latin Americans in Oslo. This group occupies an interesting place among other migratory groups, as they are a little group with high levels of education at the moment of migration and high levels of employment. In this sense, Latin Americans can be considered “successful” or “integrated” immigrants, according to most indicators.

1.2 Why Latin Americans?

During the formulation process of this project, I decided to focus on Latin Americans because this group presented an interesting perspective to the debate on immigration and integration, and because I had access to and knowledge of this group, being a Spanish-speaking Latin American migrant in Oslo myself.

Central and South American immigrants constitute per today 3.19 percent of the total immigrant population of Norway with 19.193 people (SSB 2011a, see Table 8). In Oslo, Central and South Americans represent 3.2 percent of the immigrant population of the city, and thus constitute a rather small group. Very little specific information on Latin Americans is provided by Statistics Norway, as the group is most often included in the general statistics for African, Asian, and Latin American background immigrants. Nevertheless, some reports such as current immigration trends, do provide discriminated statistics for the group (SSB 2011a, see Table 13). This report shows that the nationalities with the largest number of Latin American immigrants in Norway during the past ten years are Brazilians, followed by Chileans and Colombians. Still, the biggest group is constituted by Chileans who started immigrating to Norway over 30 years ago.

Latin Americans form a little group in Norway, in contrast to Latin Americans in other parts of Europe or the U.S.A. addressed in sociolinguistic research comparable to this project (e.g., Carranza 1998; De Fina 2003; Relaño Pastor 2010). Moreover, the general position in the host society is also different as in Norway, Latin Americans have among the lowest levels of unemployment for “non-Western”² immigrants (SSB 2011d), lower

² Statistics Norway no longer categorizes immigrants into Western and non-Western background, but they use other terms for referring to the same groups. Since, the categorization is the same, but rather the labels

than immigrants with a background from Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe (including EU countries), and are not the focus of media attention in relation to criminality and violence, as it is the case for Latin Americans in the U.S.A.

I found very few studies focusing on Latin Americans in Scandinavia, and most of them focused either on the Scandinavian born second generation (Lundström 2007), or on the exile generation that arrived in Scandinavia in the late 1970s and 80s (Lindholm Narváez 2008). In this thesis on the other hand, I will focus on other Latin Americans: those that migrated to Norway during the past ten years, as part of the highest immigration inflow.

The notion of *immigrant* used in all statistical and sociological studies cited here implies a stable concept of a single resettlement process that takes place once and is permanent. The notion of *migrant* better suits the participants in this project, as it will be argued in the analyses, and it will be preferred over *immigrant* when possible.

1.3 Conclusion

In this introductory chapter I have presented the general goals of this thesis, the general context of migration studies in Norway to which this thesis can contribute, and presented the group that will be the focus of analysis: recent Latin American migrants to Oslo.

The structure of the thesis is as it follows: Chapter 2, Theoretical background, introduces a review of previous work on categorization and identity in discourse studies that is relevant to this project, as well as an introduction into narrative analysis. In Chapter 3, Methodology and data, there is a detailed description of the methods used for data gathering, of the selection of the corpus of narratives that constitutes the data for analysis and of the decision process that lead to it. Chapter 4, Analysis, consists of the detailed analysis of the corpus of narratives, whereas in Chapter 5, Discussion and conclusion, the observations made in the analyses are further discussed in relation to the research questions with a following conclusion.

have changed, I prefer to use the terms Western and non-Western here, as it makes the categorizations underlying the analyses of Statistics Norway clearer.

2 Theoretical background

This chapter presents an overview of the different theoretical frameworks that conceptualize social categorization processes in discourse, namely narrative and discourse analysis, in order to elucidate the role these processes play in the construction of identity in narrative. The chapter is structured as follows: first, there is an introduction to the general field of identity study in narrative, followed by a presentation of previous work on categorization in conversation and narrative. The final section provides an overview and brief discussion of the analytical concepts and tools relevant to these research traditions.

2.1 Narrative and Identities

According to Blommaert (2005), current work on identity studies builds almost exclusively on a constructionist approach to identity that conceives of it as neither given nor static, but as negotiated and achieved in interaction, thus situated and dynamic (Bauman 2000). Constructionist approaches to identity emerge in opposition to what researchers consider to be essentialist definitions of individuals and group identities, represented within the field of sociolinguistics by variationist studies of linguistic variables as indexical of social variables, such as age, class, gender, and so on. In these approaches, identity is often thought of in terms of static identifications of individuals with social variables, often assigned by the researcher, instead of as negotiated in interaction and *with* the researcher (Benwell and Stokoe 2006). Within a constructionist approach, on the other hand, identity is not a singular concept, as individuals often have and construct different identities for themselves in different contexts and in interaction with different individuals, and it is therefore usual to refer to *identities* in plural (De Fina 2003: 16). It should nevertheless be kept in mind that a radical constructionist position on identity, as solely or mainly emergent in interaction, ignores the constant and regular aspects of group and individual's identities. These regularities exist across contexts and situations, and are relative to the abstract representations of group identities, which are culturally determined and at least partially conventionalized, such as "man," "woman," "child," "immigrant," "foreigner," etc. Researchers within the field of sociolinguistics have pointed out the methodological limits of a purely constructionist approach to identity that ignores the continued or stable aspects of identities (Joseph 2004; Lanza and

Svendsen 2007) since it does not provide any means for assessing socially shared representations of group identities available to speakers. Moreover, the implications of a purely constructionist approach have been qualified as “theoretical inadequateness” (van Dijk 2008), as they describe a speaker as free to make unconstrained choices in relation to a particular context, and not bound by a repertoire of available linguistic resources. These researchers advocate for a “synthetical,” or middle position on identity (Mæhlum 2008: 109), one that gives relevance to the schematic, more stable aspects of group identities, as well as to the locally negotiated dimension of identity that is dependant on its immediate context of interaction. Identity is then both stable and dynamic, as in the metaphor of a river: identity is both fluid and in constant movement as the river flows, and stable and constant as the riverbed, which determines the flow of the river but is simultaneously carved and shaped by the constant movement of the water mass (Mæhlum 2008).

Language and discourse occupy a key role in the formation of identities, as argued in the work of philosophers like Foucault (1969) and Derrida (1967). Individuals resort to symbolic resources to negotiate and construct identities, and there is no better symbolic system available to individuals than language. Discourse then, is a site of the production of social identities — as individuals are conceived of as subjects of dominant discourses with varying degrees of agency or will, according to different philosophers. We will not go further into the sociological and philosophical implications of individual agency and social determinism associated with the mentioned theories, since it exceeds the goals for this project. For a critical review of the relation between language, ideology and power relevant to conversation and discourse analyses, see Erickson (2004) and Blommaert (2005).

Regarding the specific case of narrative as a type of discourse, the act of telling past events is an essential part of the constitution of the self. It is often stated that in telling our life stories we are building our lives (Bruner 1987; Baynham 2006), because it is in the process of narrating experiences that we make sense of past events. We give meaning to our experiences by verbalizing them, selecting what is relevant and what is not, and by establishing meaningful connections between events. The study of identities in narrative has become a fertile field within discourse analysis since this methodological approach allows us to address both local processes of identity construction and global contexts that exceed the immediate context of interaction.

[T]elling a story allows us to create a “story world” in which we can represent ourselves against a backdrop of cultural expectations about a typical course of action; our identities as social beings emerge as we construct our own individual experiences as a way to position ourselves in relation to social and cultural expectations. (Schiffrin 1996: 170)

In the act of narrating, speakers construct “story worlds” where identities and social relations are represented, played, and evaluated from the interactional context in which the narratives emerge. Thus narratives provide speakers with an arena where they can reformulate previous experiences and take stances or position themselves in relation to their multiple social identities. The study of identity in narrative has been defined as “the third wave” in narrative analysis (Georgakopoulou 2007), and has more recently turned towards the study of identity construction in a migration context. De Fina (2003, 2006) works within this new tradition of narrative analysis that focuses on migrant groups’ identity constructions, including a focus on categorization and group identities. She argues that identities are not only achieved in interaction, but they are also relative to the ascription of identity by others, as there are certain schematic aspects of categories available to speakers which make these processes possible. Still, to posit the existence of schematic representations of categories is by no means to posit an essentialist account of identity, since individuals cannot be reduced to static social categories. Nevertheless, migrants define themselves and are defined by others in interaction by resorting to conventionalized linguistic and social resources.

Identity is a fragile construction of different facets of the ‘self’ and ‘other’ within social units such as interactions, encounters and situations during which we draw from numerous material and symbolic resources, including but not limited to language, for continuous substantive and ritual support. (Schiffrin 2006: 110)

Hence category labels and categorization play a key role in the process of identity negotiation in interaction, at the interactional level and in relation to larger processes of self- and other-representation relevant to group identities.

2.2 Identity and categorization in conversation and discourse

Group membership assignment through the use of group categories is a fundamental resource for identity construction, since the sense of belonging to a group is a crucial component of social identities (Tajfel 1981; De Fina 2003). The perspective of categorization to address the processes of identity construction in narrative implies a

social constructionist approach to identity as negotiated in interaction, but also gives relevance to the cognitive schematic representations of categories, as resources in interaction as discussed in the previous subsection. In the following I will present discourse analytic traditions within conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics that have taken the task of analyzing categorization in interactional discourse: Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis, and Narrative and identity studies.

2.2.1 Conversation Analysis and Member Categorization Devices

One of the first researchers to focus on categorization in discourse was the sociologist Harvey Sacks. Working within the tradition of ethnomethodology, Sacks (1992) developed an analytical model for the analysis of categorization in interaction within the framework of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA), which he also developed. Sacks coined the concept *Member Categorization Devices* (MCD) for conceiving of the processes by which participants in interaction define others and themselves in terms of culturally established categories. An MCD contains at least one *collection of categories*, that is a group of categories that “go together” in a set, such as mother, father, daughter, son, etc., and rules for the application of these categories (Schegloff 2007). The collections of categories are empirical in the sense that they are culturally and socially determined, and thus provide sets of relevancies for conduct and participation. In this sense, the notion of categories seems to be closely related to social roles.

Each category within a *collection* is defined as *inference rich*, since it provides the common sense knowledge people share about assigned categories, and is *protected against induction* in the sense that if one particular member of a category does not present the characteristics expected of the category, this does not necessarily disprove the knowledge represented in the category, but rather causes the individual to be perceived of as deviant, or an exception for the category. Sacks also describes the existence of *category bound activities* as part of the common sense knowledge implied in categories, that is the knowledge that certain activities are conceived of as characteristic of a category in a manner that permits alluding to a category by merely referring to an activity related to it, as in Sack’s classical example: “The baby cried. The mommy picked it up” (Sacks 1992: 584), where the correct interpretation of the sentence, ”a baby cried and its mommy

picked it up” depends on the recognition of crying, and picking up/comforting as category bound activities for “baby” and “mommy” respectively, along with the meaningful sequential order of the clauses (*first* the baby cries, *then* the mommy picked it up).

Different traditions within what Schifffrin (1994) broadly defines as *Approaches to Discourse* deal with the social aspects of language and language use in different manners. Conversational analysts, like Sacks, often choose to focus on the conversational sequences and resources deployed by participants, and include the macro social and cultural references in the analysis only if they are *made relevant to* the interactional situation by the participants in conversation. The study of MCDs should thus be grounded in the interaction at all moments, by looking for the discursive resources participants use to orient to different categories, and not by referring to the larger social context for establishing categorizations. Nevertheless, this perspective does not imply that the socio-cultural context of the interactions is completely out of focus, since the analyst must always be aware of the cultural and social context of the interaction in order to recognize patterns such as *category bound activities* and which elements constitute a *set of categories*. The discussion on the definition of “context” as *local* or *macro social* exceeds categorization devices and is related to the methodological standpoints of CA. However, researchers from other traditions than CA often use the analytical tool of CA, though they do not take their standpoints in their analysis. We will not go further into this matter here, but for further discussion see for example, Hutchby and Woffit (2008), Blommaert (2005; Chapter 3) and Duranti (1997).

2.2.2 Membership Categorization Analysis

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) is a direction in the study of linguistic interaction that focuses on categorization as a key component in the process of constructing and negotiating identities in interaction (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998). This line of inquiry was inspired by Sack’s work on MCD (1992), and conceives of identity as primarily locally negotiated. It focuses however not only on the sequencing and organization of talk (primary focus of CA), but also “pays attention to the situated and reflexive use of categories in everyday and institutional interaction, as well as in interview, media and other textual data” (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 38).

Researchers working within this approach are not preoccupied with the cognitive representations of categories, and dismiss analytical directions that seek to address the schematic dimensions of categories, considering that they operate with an essentialist understanding of identity. Nevertheless, MCA does address the predictable features associated with identity categories, as “for a person to ‘have an identity’ ... is to be cast into a *category with associated characteristics or features* ... A person, then, can be a member of an infinity of categories, and each category will imply that she or he has this or that range of characteristics” (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998: 3-4). But in order to become relevant to the analysis, categories need to be *made relevant* and *oriented to* in interaction, as held by CA.

According to Schegloff (2007), researchers working within MCA do not necessarily follow the developments made in the field of CA after Sacks, and therefore lack the methodological rigor that would constitute this line of inquiry into a field of its own. Based on Schegloffs critique, MCA’s analytical methods can be potentially problematic for the study of categorization since by not following the methodological developments in CA, MCA makes a poor case for the claim of studying categories “with associated features” *primarily* in relevance to the local context of the interaction. CA’s analytical standpoint on the notion of *context* is supported by a solid methodology which, according to Schegloff, MCA lacks. Never minding the status of MCA as a sub-discipline, researchers working within this framework have produced a considerable amount of research on categorization in the construction of identities, in the areas of gender (Stokoe 2003) and ethnicity studies (Day 1998), to name just a couple of examples.

2.2.3 Categorization in narrative and identity analysis

De Fina’s (2003, 2006) work on narrative and identity in the narratives of Mexican undocumented migrants in the United States takes a different perspective from that of CA and MCA. De Fina proposes a model of analysis of identity construction in narratives of personal experience. In spite of the fact that both CA and De Fina operate with a social constructionist approach to identity, De Fina’s perspective stresses the importance of the *schematic* level of cognitive representation for the construction of individual identities in interaction. In focusing exclusively on the interactionally achieved aspects of identity, De Fina argues, one is left with the analytical problem of dealing with the implicit and shared

meaning that sustains processes of identification in narrative (De Fina 2006: 355). Thus De Fina explicitly positions herself as working with a wider notion of social context than CA and MCA, one that includes the socio-cultural constructs of discourse and ideologies (De Fina 2003: 29-30).

De Fina argues that the schematic, at least partially conventionalized representations of group identities shared by members of a community or group, play a crucial role in the process of individuals' identity construction as they can take a stance in relation to the schematic representations of group identities. Such an approach to identity study seems to be in line with what is argued in social psychology theories, such as "social identity theory" (Tajfel 1981), according to which social identities are defined by the individual's identification with a group that is constituted by a reflexive knowledge of group membership and by an emotional attachment to this belonging (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 25-6). Group identities then have a cognitive dimension in the individual's knowledge of membership that allows individuals to negotiate and construct individual identities by positioning themselves in relation to available group categories. De Fina's model of identity is "synthetical" as it addresses both the fixed and the fluid aspects of identity, like in the river metaphor described in 2.1.

De Fina's analysis takes a point of departure in van Dijk's (1998) work on ideology and group membership analysis. This author proposes a sociocognitive perspective on discourse and ideology that conceives of the cognitive representations of groups as basic schemata in which people represent the social structure and relationships of a group. These schemas contain information on the social categories that are relevant to self-representation, on the criteria available for assigning membership into a group, on the manner in which members of a group relate to members of other groups, and on the goals and values important to members of a group. Van Dijk (1998: 57) uses the terms *schema* or *schemata* for the abstract cognitive representations of group identities:

[I]f we want to explain how people perceive objects, scenes or events, how they produce or understand sentences and stories, the knowledge they have to do so is assumed to be organized in such schematic patterns. People have ideal, abstract or prototypical schemata for the structures of a chair, an event, a story, people, groups as well as social structures. ... Such schemata of naive, commonsense knowledge usually consist of a number of characteristic *categories* (such as the complication and the resolution in a story), that may be combined in a specific order and hierarchy, and allowing for variable terminal elements. ... what is being described here is not real-world objects, but our socially shared, conventional and cultural *knowledge* about such objects, that is, mental structures or representations.

Van Dijk's model introduces what he calls a *sociocognitive interface* that accounts for the connections between discourse and social context, as it is not the material context that determines discourse, but rather the cognitive representation individuals have of social structures and relations as an "intersubjective understanding shared by members of a group or community" (van Dijk 2008: 118-9).

Nevertheless, van Dijk (2008: 201) is critical to discourse analytical studies of identity and storytelling that operate with a constructionist notion of identity, and considers that "this currently very popular but reductionist approach to identity is much too vague and theoretically inadequate." This critique stems from van Dijk's perspective on *social identities*, which are not reducible to the ongoing process of contextualized negotiations and construction of an image of the self in interaction, but are heavily anchored in cognitive schematic and prototypical representations of group identities that have stable, constant characteristics available to members of a certain community (van Dijk 2009: 72). In this sense, van Dijk claims a "synthetical" position on identity grounded on a cognitive model of social interaction, by which presupposed aspects of group identities must be stable enough in order to be conventionalized and thus presupposed in interaction.

In a critique of van Dijk's model of ideology (1995), Blommaert (2005: 162) argues that the notion of individual cognitive representations of macro social constructions stresses the cognitive component of the social structure while he does not provide an analytical model for how ideologies come to be in the individual mind, nor how they acquire status of socially shared cognitive representations. In this sense, Blommaert's critique seems to aim at the predominance to the cognitive element over the emergent situated practice that gives rise to it.

Van Dijk's critique of social constructionist approaches to identities specifically mentions the volume *Discourse and Identity* De Fina, et al (2006) as one of the examples of radical constructionism. This critique, however, is much too general as there is a great variety of positions regarding identity in the volume. De Fina's own paper (2006) is part of the quoted volume, and operates with a synthetic approach to identity, as we have already seen, which gives no basis to van Dijk's critique.

[R]ecognizing the centrality of interaction and of member's orientation to the study of identity, does not, in my view, automatically entail the rejection of the existence of cognitive aspects in the management of identity categories and concepts, nor does it resolve the analytic problem of how categories are interpreted by interactants, given that much of what is being conveyed about

category membership is a matter of shared understanding and implicit meanings. Thus the study of categorization and identity should avoid two equally misleading assumptions: one is that the meaning of categories is exclusively managed at a local level and is in some sense “manifest” only within the interaction at hand; the other is that speakers hold in their minds a certain number of well-defined categories with associated meanings and that all they do in specific interactions is apply them. (De Fina 2006: 355)

De Fina introduces the level of *schematic representations* of categories in the discursive analysis of categorization in narrative in order to assess the conventionalized, socially shared meaning of group identities. Cognitive, schematic representations of categories, function rather as “socially established resources” that speakers deploy for constructing identity in narrative. These images of collective identities include membership categories with defining properties, actions related to identities, representations of relationships with other collective identities, and belief systems (De Fina 2006: 357). Speakers assign group membership categories in narratives and consequently position themselves in relation to these identifications. De Fina argues that in presenting characters in the narrative and making relevant their membership into a group through categorization, the narratives convey that the behavior of the character in the story world is attributable to her or his belonging in that group. The characters become representatives for the group of which they are identified as members, and it is in this manner that narratives fulfill an argumentative function— by exemplifying the characteristics and behaviors of a group of people, and evaluating them at the same time.

[C]ategorization devices and the way they are used in discourse are a crucial area for the analysis of identities because the type of identifications, the connections that narrators establish between those identifications and actions in storyworlds, and the negotiation of their position with respect to actions and identities are both reflective and constitutive of social processes of ascription, perception and struggle over categorization itself. (De Fina 2003: 141)

Group membership is not static and absolute, and in presenting oneself with a group category, individuals can reconsider or distance themselves from aspects of their membership. De Fina’s analysis locates itself in the tension area between these two levels or dimensions of identity: between the membership in a group, and the locally negotiated definitions of the self.

De Fina’s analysis goes one step beyond the local and social contextualization of group categories in interaction and conceives of the concrete instances of categorization as the potential site of reformulation of ideologies and beliefs. Hence De Fina (2003, 2006) develops a methodology for studying categorization in narrative by resorting to analytical concepts from discourse analysis and narrative analysis, as these provide detailed

descriptions of locally situated processes of identity construction and how these both reproduce and reformulate conceptions of social groups through the use of categories.

Analysts need ... to be able to link local identities to shared ideologies and beliefs, but they also need to account for the fact that the construction and presentation of identity is a process in constant development and that one of its crucial sites of negotiation is interaction. It is indeed in concrete social activities and within specific instances of discourse that shared categories and beliefs about identity become the object of resistance, alternative formulations and renegotiation. (De Fina 2006: 355)

The schematic, conventionalized representations of categories determine concrete instances of use, as they establish the “socially shared resources” available to speakers, but it is in those concrete instances of use that those categories are not merely “used,” “deployed,” but they are also contested, reformulated, expanded. As in the river metaphor, both elements are intrinsically united in a mutually determining reflexive relation. It is in this sense that it can be said that identity is *emergent* in interaction (Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Interaction is both the locus of the reproduction of socio-culturally determined structures, and the site of the individual reformulation of these structures through individuals’ positionings. Categorizations in narrative both reproduce and entrench the *schematas*, but also imply a degree of local contextualization and reformulation that can potentially lead to change in its representation.

De Fina’s model of analysis of identity in narrative has proven fruitful, and has more recently been applied in the analysis as “fitting in” narratives (Relaño Pastor 2010) and “language conflict” narratives (Relaño Pastor and De Fina 2005; De Fina and King 2011). These studies take a thematic division of narratives as a point of departure, according to which they group stories which have similar complicating events and combine it with De Fina’s analysis of categorization in narrative, in order to assess the relevance of ethnic categorization as part of the formulation of particular experiences of migrants. The analysis of the complicating events in the narratives singles out conflicting social areas in the context of migration, such as the case of being discriminated against, or treated badly on the basis of ethnic appearance, or lack of knowledge of the majority language, or poor linguistic performance. In these studies, narrative analysis allows the researchers to focus both on the thematization of migrants’ experiences as well as on the assignment of social categories, thus conceiving narrative as one of the possible loci for the formulation of identity in migration contexts.

The different approaches to categorization presented above introduce complementing perspectives on the phenomenon, as they work with a constructionist notion of identity but choose to focus on different aspects of the phenomenon. From the perspective of CA, categorization and identity are studied as mainly a locally situated process. From the perspective of Interactional Sociolinguistics presented in De Fina's model, categorizations and identities are also locally negotiated and emergent in interaction, but sustained by the schematic representations of group categories which function as socially shared resources. Regarding the data for analysis, CA usually studies naturally occurring conversations, while De Fina focuses on narratives elicited in interview.

Below I will present the discourse analytical traditions that have focused on narrative, to then introduce a more detailed account of the analytical concepts used in De Fina's model of identity construction in narrative.

2.3 Discourse and narrative analysis

Narratives are stories, narrations of usually past experiences, both oral and written, that are characteristic of human communication. The pervasive nature of narrative as a human activity has been pointed out by several analysts as a cross-cultural, universal phenomenon (Hymes 1996). Narrative entered the field of linguistics with Labov's (1966) studies of social variation in language use. Labov focused on stigmatized linguistic varieties that were considered "in deficit" in relation to the standard (Black English Vernacular, as a central example), and narratives were gathered as a methodological resource for obtaining a varied sample of discourse styles and vernacular speech (Schiffrin 1994). However, the narratives themselves proved to be a fruitful object of analysis, a discursive genre with its own structures and functions, and Labov and Waletzky's ([1967] 1997) foundational paper presented a detailed study of the regularities of narrative structure. This work remains current. Still, some aspects of Labov and Waletzky's definition of narrative have been challenged, and newer, broader formulations of narrative are today used by discourse analysts (Ochs and Capps 2001; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008). Labov and Waletzky's approach is structurally motivated and defines sets of criteria and analytical concepts for the identification and structural analysis of narratives and its parts, whereas more contemporary definitions of narrative are

interactionally motivated and are occupied with the functions of narrative at an interactional level.

I will now present a brief review of the most significant aspects of these approaches, as they will be used in the analysis of the data, followed by the introduction to specific research models on categorization and identity analysis in narrative.

2.3.1 The canonical narrative: Labov

According to Labov (1972b: 359-60), a narrative is “one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred.” This conception of narrative, as matching or reproducing a sequence of events, is built on a linear conception of narrative time (Mishler 2006) and it is reflected in the minimal structure of the narrative; thus the sequential order of the narrative clauses corresponds to the temporal sequence of events represented in the narrative. Narrative clauses are defined as the clauses that contain “at least one temporal juncture,” such that if their sequential order is reversed, the order of events in the story world changes.

The overall narrative structure is more than the bare skeleton of narrative clauses, and includes all the free clauses (with no temporal junctures) that fulfill other narrative functions. Labov and Waletzky ([1967] 1997) and Labov (1972b) identify six structural components of narrative. The *abstract* is the opening to the narrative that provides a summary for the story about to be presented. The *orientation* presents the necessary background information the auditorium needs to follow the story: person, place, time and behavioral situation. The *complicating action* is composed of a series of narrative clauses that, as the name indicates, mark the tension peak of the narrative action. The *evaluation* conveys the point the narrative attempts to make, and makes clear why that particular story is worth telling. Evaluations are performed at different levels and by different strategies, and are pervasive to the whole narrative since they constitute an extremely important function of the narrative structure³. The *resolution* is the concluding part of the narrative action and appears after the complicating action. The *coda* is the finalization of

³ There is a contrast in the formulation of the evaluation between Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), as the first defines a structural component consisting of the evaluative clauses, whereas the second defines a function that is fulfilled by the narrative at many levels simultaneously. Here I describe and use this second formulation.

the narrative and has the function of closing the narrative by reconnecting the narrated universe with the present of the reporting world.

There are two main functions of the narrative, a referential and an evaluative one. The referential function has to do with the presentation of a sequence of events ordered in a manner that corresponds to how the events actually happened, or at least to how the narrator presents them as having happened; it is in this sense that narrative refers to reality. The evaluative function of narrative has to do with the arrangement of those actions, the focalization of certain aspects, the interpretations offered about the action sequences, and the overall meaning and unit of the narrative. This function is as important to the definition of narrative as the referential, since

[A] narrative that contains only an orientation, complicating action, and result is not a complete narrative. It may carry out the referential function perfectly, and yet seem difficult to understand. Such a narrative lacks significance: it has no point. (Labov and Waletzky [1967] 1997: 28)

The evaluation conveys the point of the narrative, the reason why a story is worth telling, and how it should be understood. The structural definition of narrative can seem too narrow when applied to many different types of data (Patterson 2008), as it defines a textual structure that is monologic and detached from surrounding conversation and the immediate interactional context in which it emerges or is elicited. Nevertheless, the notion of evaluation as an essential component of narrative analysis is still valid, reformulated as *moral stance* (Ochs and Capps 2001), among others, by contemporary researchers. These scholars are often preoccupied with narratives that do not necessarily fit the canonical definition and consequently propose new analytical models; some of these will be addressed below in the following subsection.

2.3.2 Contemporary approaches to narrative analysis

The construction of narrative as a linear succession of actions is undoubtedly central to the notion of narrative, but there are different resources available to present a story, such as hypothetical and repetitive events. Carranza's (1998) work on *low-narrativity narratives* suggests an extension of the operative definition of narrative by analyzing hypothetical stories of possible scenarios, counterfactual stories juxtaposed to actual accounts, and narrations of repetitive actions in the past as valuable discursive resources with argumentative functions. These types of narrative structure are considered deviations from the linear succession of actions from the perspective of a clock-time model of

narrative temporality, and do not fit the canonical narrative as exemplified in Labov's model.

Ochs and Capps (2001) reformulated the classical definition of narrative in the light of their data on everyday conversation, where naturally occurring narratives emerged from, and were embedded in, conversation. These authors replaced the structural definition of narrative with a set of narrative *dimensions* that can be realized through different resources and are gradient in nature.

Dimensions	Possibilities on the narrativity scale	
	High	Low
<i>Tellership</i>	One active teller	Multiple co-tellers
<i>Tellability</i>	High	Low
<i>Embeddedness</i>	Detached	Embedded
<i>Linearity</i>	Closed temporal and causal order	Open temporal and causal order
<i>Moral stance</i>	Certain, constant	Uncertain, fluid
	<u><i>Canonical narrative</i></u> ← ————— → <u><i>Small story</i></u>	

Table 1: Narrative dimensions (based on Ochs and Capps 2001: 20)

The dimensions focus on different aspects of the narrative. *Tellership* is the amount of tellers that participate in narrating the narrative, as in conversational narratives interlocutors might collaborate in the tellership to different degrees; *Tellability* refers to whether the story is worth telling or not; *Embeddedness* is relative to how detached from conversation, or embedded in it a narrative is; *Linearity* has to do with temporal and causal development of the narrative; and *Moral Stance* is a notion close to that of evaluation, as it signals the narrator's perspective on the narrated events, and moral meanings associated with them.

This notion of narrative is broader than a set of formally described structures, since it introduces a gradual definition. The possibilities for each one of the narrative dimensions presented in Table 1, lie between the two poles, or extremes for the dimensions, and one particular narrative might be realized in any point between the extremes. With this model, researchers are able to address both canonical narratives, and narratives that have multiple

narrators, no linear progression of events, and so on, but can still be considered narratives because they carry the function of making sense out of past events. The extreme opposite to the canonical narrative in the dimensional model of narrative is *small stories* (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008), which are highly embedded in the conversational context, often with more than one teller, with low tellability, and defined in opposition to the big, autobiographical narratives.

Ochs and Capps' (2001) model of narrative has the advantage of not only assessing a broader spectrum of narrative forms, but also includes the conversational context of the interview in the analysis of the narrative, which provides valuable information on the group dynamics, on how the narrator interacts with others by seeking and obtaining or not, support from the other participants on his evaluations and interpretations of the events presented. This is specifically relevant to the goals of this thesis, as the process of identity construction takes place in the interaction and is directly influenced by it. Nevertheless, Labov's description of the narrative structure is a good analytical tool that provides well established categories for the analysis of narrative sequences. Both approaches to narrative analysis presented above are useful to the analysis in that they consider different aspects of the same phenomenon and it is possible to combine them. We will return to this point in the introduction of the analysis in Chapter 4.

2.3.3 Categorization in narrative

De Fina's (2003; 2006) model of analysis of categorization in group identity construction in narrative considers that identities are constructed simultaneously in two levels: in the level of the story worlds created in the narratives and through the categorizations and actions presented there, and another level related to the interactional positionings narrators and interlocutors take in the narrating universe in relation to the categorizations presented in the story worlds.

First is the level of schematic representations. At this level, narratives are loci for the display of self-representations because they build story-worlds in which narrators introduce themselves and others as figures and use categories to define their identity (or the identity of others) that are often presented (implicitly or explicitly) as playing crucial roles in the explanation of the actions themselves. Thus, stories provide **models of the world** in which actions and reactions are related to identities and therefore represent and conceptualize social relationships. (De Fina 2006: 356, emphasis is mine)

The schematic representations of identities are displayed in the connections between identifications of group categories and the types of actions assigned to characters. It is in these connections that the representations of self and other are observable. De Fina (2003) uses the concept of *agency* to trace the prototypical representations of categories in the ascription of actions and reactions to characters in the storyworld, but De Fina (2006) prefers the formulation of “social action” as a better description. Both concepts are used to conceive of identity at the same analytical level in both articles, the story world level. In more general terms both notions refer to similar phenomena, though the notion of *agency* has strong connotations in other fields, as we are about to see. The change in the use of the terms between 2003 and 2006 is not argued for, nor problematized by De Fina, and I will not consider it to be significant for the formulation of the model.

Agency is a broad concept that has been widely used in the fields of philosophy, sociology, history, anthropology, linguistics, and more. Ahearn (2001: 112) accounts thoroughly for those uses and proposes the following operational definition: “Agency refers to the socioculturally mediated capacity to act.” In this bare definition, agency is defined as a socially inscribed capacity to take action, and since it is socially and culturally constrained, agency is relevant to, and partly defined by, power relations inherent to social structure. Different conceptions of agency will focus on different grades of the scale of social determinacy — from social determinism to individual voluntarism. Ahearn warns researchers about the need for defining this concept more precisely in concrete analyses. Therefore, there is a need to use this concept to concentrate on the more schematic aspects of categories, that is on the socio-culturally determined actions that are presented as typical, or expected from particular categories.

Characters, then, are identified by categories that present or imply different agencies, and certain sequences of actions imply a category, as we saw earlier for the case of “category bound activities.” Agency can be seen in two elements: in the actions and reaction sequences ascribed to characters in the story world, and in the *voice* (Bakhtin [1952-53] 1986) assigned to characters, that is, to what extent characters identified with group categories are given the possibility of speaking in the narratives.

The second level of analysis ... is that of interactional negotiation. At this level, stories present an arena for the negotiation of **stances** vis-à-vis shared (or unshared) representations of group identity. Narrators convey implicit stances towards social definitions of who they are through the use of performance devices. (De Fina 2006: 356, emphasis is mine)

De Fina uses the concept of *positioning* in 2003 and *stance* in 2006 to refer to the same process of interactional negotiation by which speakers *position themselves*, or *take a stance* in relation to the schematic representations of group identities. These two concepts overlap each other, as *stance* is a more general and newer formulation that seeks to include previous work on positioning, and is defined by Jaffe (2009: 3) as “taking up a position with respect to the form or the content of one’s utterance.” This process of *stancetaking* is done simultaneously at different levels, as speakers position themselves towards their texts, their interlocutors, and towards the interactional context. This concept is specifically relevant to *self and other categorization*, because it also through taking a stance in opposition to another that individual identities emerge, and not only through self identifications through category labels.

[I]ndividual identities are defined within social formations, by taking up a position, individuals automatically invoke a constellation of associated social identities. In doing so, speakers project, assign, propose, constrain, define, or otherwise shape the subject position of their interlocutors (Jaffe 2009: 8)

Categorization is a process essential to the emergence of social identities and a constitutive element of individual identities. Nevertheless, no individual’s identity is reducible to membership into a particular group, thus individuals take stances in relation to membership. It is in this sense that group categories can function as resources or strategies in the construction of identities, as speakers are given the possibility to make relative, accept, or challenge assigned identifications. At an interactional level, speakers position themselves in relation to their interlocutors, to the stories told and categorizations made in the narratives.

De Fina’s model of analysis of identity construction in narratives of personal experience is a theoretically viable model for this thesis as it allows to assess both the schematic representations of categories, as well as the interactions and local positionings participants take in relation to the categorizations and thus address matters relevant the research questions of the project (cf. 1).

2.4 Conclusion

This project focuses on categorization as a discursive strategy in narratives, a linguistic resource for the construction of identities in interaction. This approach to identity builds on a constructionist notion of identity that focuses on the local processes of identity

construction in interaction, and distances itself from essentialist, static identifications of individuals as members of social groups with assigned attributes. Nevertheless, the model of analysis of categorization in narrative this thesis follows, considers that the schematic representations of categories are important resources for constructing identity, since they are part of the shared socio-cultural and linguistic knowledge of speakers.

An analysis of identity construction as categorization can thus be done in these terms, by observing the categories used in the narratives as discursive strategies with schematic, shared meanings attached to them which allow participants to position themselves in relation to them, and in relation to the interlocutors. Consequently with these goals, such an approach takes an interactional sociolinguistic perspective on interaction that brings the larger social and cultural contexts into the analysis as a means of assessing the schematic dimensions of group categories used in narratives. The corpus of narratives that constitutes the material for analysis, as well as a detailed description of the methods used for gathering the data and the decision process that lead to the composition of the corpus are presented below in Chapter 3, Methodology and data.

3 Methodology and data

This project aims at tracing identity construction processes in interaction with a focus on categorization, and the data for the analyses are narratives of personal experience told by Latin Americans living in Oslo. Our approach then rests on a qualitative analysis of a series of narratives that seeks to track and compare different uses of group categories for self- and other-identification.

3.1 Which Latin Americans?

Out of the few studies and statistical analyses that provide specific information on the Latin American community in Norway, the majority of them focus on Chileans since they are the largest national group of Latin Americans in absolute terms, including first and second generations.⁴ Chileans started migrating to Norway during the 70's and 80's escaping from political persecution and settled in large numbers in Scandinavia. This is also the reason why most of the studies on Chileans pay attention to their status as exiles as one of the strongest characteristics of the group.

However, the predominance of the Chilean immigrants in the composition of the figures for Latin American immigration seems to have ended for the past ten years (cf. 1.2). For this reason, I decided to work with Latin Americans who had lived in Norway for a period no longer than ten years at the time of the interview, as a means of targeting the more contemporary migration flow from Latin America. Moreover, I decided to exclude from the selection all the political exiles from Latin America that arrived in Norway, historically and more contemporarily, (Chileans, Argentines, Uruguayans, and Colombians and Peruvians more recently), because the political background for migration and the impossibility of return to the home country made their situation special and other factors would have to be taken into consideration in a study that seeks to assess identity construction processes. On the other hand, it became more interesting from an identity perspective to look into the experience of those who moved to Norway during the past ten years, and were still “fresh” in formulating their experiences. And as it has been during

⁴ In Norway, the statistics on immigration include both first generation immigrants and second generations that are Norwegian-born of two foreign parents.

this period that the historically biggest immigration waves have arrived, my study would provide a contemporary approach to a social relevant theme.

While the project developed, it became also relevant to include participants who had lived in Oslo for at least two or three years prior to the data collection. This was done to ensure that the participants had actually had some experiences in Norway and had (at least some) knowledge of the values and social norms of society. Moreover, even when the interview was to be held in Spanish, it was relevant for the participants to have a minimum degree of communicative competence (Hymes 1972) in Norwegian to ensure that they actually understood “how things worked” in Norway. There are people who live in foreign countries and cannot, or need not, speak the language(s) of the host country (work-related migration in international work markets, diaspora life style, etc.) and it can always be questioned to what degree migrants misinterpret the culture in which they have inserted themselves. However, knowledge of the language and some level of communicative competence are minimum requirements for actively participating by referring to, or having knowledge of, important political and social debates in the host society.

3.2 The participants

I used my personal network of Latin Americans in Oslo to gather three participants for an interview, originally intended as a pilot project which later showed to provide sufficient material to be analyzed in an MA thesis. There were three participants present: Victor, Susana and Juana (all pseudonyms), and myself as the moderator. I had met the participants at a public adult educational center in Oslo where Norwegian courses are arranged, either directly or through common friends from the same courses. I have known them all for several years now, though the amount of contact we have had varies. They had not met each other before the interview. In this sense, the group did not exist on its own and was formed as such for the purpose of the interview. I as researcher was then the contact point for gathering the participants.

All participants had lived in Oslo for approximately five years at the time of the interview. Four nationalities are represented in the study through all the participants (including myself as the moderator): Chile, Peru, Mexico, and Argentina. This is because I wanted to see to what extent there was a group or community feeling for Latin Americans in Oslo, and therefore did not pick out any particular nationality within this

group. All participants are natives of a geographical area and a linguistic continuum, that of Spanish in America. It should also be mentioned that all participants had lived in the capital cities of their corresponding countries, which are true metropolises with several million inhabitants and active cultural, financial, and social life.

The Latino background was made relevant to the participants not only by the selection of nationalities for the interview, but also by the setting of the interview in Spanish and my own introduction of the interview to the participants: we were all gathered to talk about our experiences as immigrants in Oslo and to give a “Latino” contribution or perspective. This was not challenged or reformulated by the participants, though the heterogeneities in the “Latino” continuum were referred to.⁵

Three of the participants are female and one is male. The ages range between 28 and 35 years of age. The gender proportion of the participants was not intended to be as it was. A couple of last minute cancellations left the composition of the group with one less male participant and an obvious unbalance: three women and one man. I decided not to reschedule since it had already been hard to find a date that suited all. The data could of course easily be analyzed from a gender perspective, problematizing stereotypical gender roles that were implicitly constructed in the narratives. Still, I did not choose to focus on this perspective as other lines of inquiry seemed more relevant to the research goals of the thesis. Nonetheless, some gender issues did emerge in the data and are part of the analyses.

The participants represent different motivations, conditions and status for immigration. One of the participants came to Norway as the spouse of a Norwegian citizen, through family reunification. Another came as part of the work and education exchange program of “au-pair” and later started a relationship, got a job, and decided to stay. The last one was born in Norway and is a Norwegian citizen, but was raised abroad and returned to Norway as an adult with a foreign spouse.

The participants can be defined as multilinguals (Li Wei 2007), as all in addition to Spanish as first language, had command of English prior to their arrival and they now

⁵ When talking about their dialects and how they had changed after living in Norway, Susana, from Peru, referred to the reaction she got from some family members about the way she spoke Spanish: like a Chilean. Peru and Chile are borderline countries with a history of armed conflict over land. There is a clear antagonist relationship between these two national identities, as there usually is among countries that share borders, history and language.

have a good command of Norwegian. They all attended courses in Norwegian as a second language and use Norwegian in their daily lives. The participants defined themselves as “bilinguals” when asked, in spite of having expressed concerns about certain aspects of their proficiency and were surprisingly insightful regarding their performance in Norwegian. Knowledge of Norwegian is a key element in the elaboration and evaluation the participants make of their experience, as it will be shown in the analyses.

All participants have four-year university degrees from their home countries, at the least. They have also managed to get recognition for that education and currently have positions that are relevant to their academic background or have entered graduate studies at Norwegian educational institutions. Hence participants can be considered *successful* within Norway’s migrant population. Consequently, the participants of the focus group constitute a rather homogenous group in relation to all of the above-named characteristics.

3.3 Data collection: the interview

In order to answer the research questions of the project, the analysis takes a qualitative approach that can address in detail the positionings and negotiations participants engage in in interaction, as a means of assessing how individual identities emerge in the local context. Hence the data needed to perform such an analysis must provide sufficient information on the interactional processes in which narratives are elicited and categorizations take place.

As opposed to various individual interviews formats, a *focus group* type of interview often is the easiest and most effective technique for producing data on the opinions and perspectives of a group of different national backgrounds and for observing how these opinions were negotiated in the interaction. Focus groups are designed to look closer into such group dynamics, by creating an environment in which participants feel comfortable to express their perceptions and opinions (Krueger and Casey 2009). Therefore, a focus group is a better-suited data gathering method for analyzing individual’s representations of social groups, by allowing the researcher to create a non-threatening environment and an in-group feeling that would benefit the emergence of group categorizations. Nevertheless, there are some disadvantages to focus groups, as Robson (2002) points out, and those are the difficulty of following individual participants, or the risk of having

group dynamics affect the performance of single participants. Nevertheless, since the focus of my analysis is on narratives and not on single participants' performance of e.g. linguistic skills, those risks are not very relevant for the present project.

Relaño Pastor (2010: 83) stresses that the nature of narrative as a “sense-making” device that can disclose participant's opinions and positions regarding the events narrated makes the narrative an extremely interesting type of data for analyzing participants' arguments and positions. Approaching narratives of personal experience through a focus group interview is then a suited data-gathering method for this project, as it provides data on both single participants through their narratives, and in the group dynamics through the support and feedback the individual obtains from the other participants while narrating. An interactional perspective on narrative is crucial to this type of analysis.

The interview took place at my home, after carefully considering other possibilities. Most participants have jobs and family to take care of during weekdays and meeting after office hours was not a suited alternative. The interview then was to be held during a weekend. This made it difficult to have the interview in an office at the university campus, since access keys and passwords are needed to enter the facilities. Moreover, meeting in an office seemed like a very formal context that would not contribute to the general tenor I intended to create for the interview. I also ruled out meeting in a café or restaurant due to the technical difficulties of voice recording in such noisy environments. Having the interview at one of the participant's home didn't seem right either, since none of the participants knew each other previously. I would have had to put a participant in the role of host, holding the meeting at her or his home, while he or she didn't know much about what the project was about nor knew the other participants he or she was inviting over. My own home then seemed like the most “natural” and “neutral” place to invite the participants to chat over coffee and cookies during a weekend day.

The duration of the total interview was one and a half hours, and it was recorded digitally by two recorders to make sure that the quality of the sound was good enough and to prevent losing data (or time) due to malfunctions. I used two “Zoom-H4” digital recorders with built-in microphones. The sound file was recorded in an Mp3 format so that it would be easier to play the data and export it into other formats, since Mp3 is nowadays one of the most popular sound formats, suitable to be exported to almost any type of software for

manipulating sound files. The interview was held in Spanish and it took place in November 2008.

3.4 Script questions

The interview was semi-structured (Robson 2002), with questions focusing on different aspects of the migration experience, such as the arrival in the host country, the motivation for the migration, the first contacts with Norwegian society, the acquisition of the Norwegian language, and so on. The formulation of the questions was intended to elicit narratives. A copy of the questionnaire used is presented in the Appendix B. The script functioned as a guide for the moderator rather than a fixed structure that needed to be followed exactly as it was formulated. The order of the questions was not followed, since some of the questions were not asked because they already had been answered spontaneously, and other topics not proposed in the questions were discussed. A Log was also written immediately after the interview was over, and some observations regarding attitudes and body language of the speakers are taken from this log.

3.5 Transcription

The interview was transcribed completely using a digital transcription program called Transcriber.⁶ I chose to work with an orthographic transcription that does not represent aspects of the phonetic realizations of the speakers. I did, however, represent the interactional aspects of the interview through overlaps, interruptions and back-channeling, at the risk of producing a detailed transcription that becomes hard to read and interpret (Johnstone 2000). Still, the interactional aspects of the narratives are relevant to elucidating how these were received by the other participants, and how narratives are co-constructed by the group.

As transcript notation I used a selection of the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson, as presented in Atkinson and Heritage (2006), some of the conventions suggested in Kjelsvik (2008), and some developed by myself in order to represent the data. A complete list of the symbols used can be found in the Appendix A.

⁶ <http://trans.sourceforge.net/>

The corpus is composed of seven narratives which were identified from the transcription of the interview (see 3.7 below for the criteria employed to identify the narratives), transcribed in further detail, and translated to English. The narratives are transcribed in numbered clauses that attempt to follow the intonational units and pauses of speakers. I included the immediate conversational contexts of the narratives in the transcription excerpts, and numbered these along with the narratives. Also, when narratives were told consecutively (see 3.7 below), these are transcribed with continued numbering. In the Appendix A the narratives are presented in the order in which they emerged in the interview, though they will not be analyzed in this order in Chapter 4, Analysis.

3.6 Some ethical considerations

As required by the University of Oslo, the project has been registered at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD) and follows the regulation for ethical use of personal information in research. This thesis is thus legally bound to follow the guidelines of NSD for safekeeping the anonymity of the participants. All names have been erased and given pseudonyms, and other general details that would make the participants easily recognizable were erased from the transcriptions, though information on the country of origin is still available as this information alone does not make their recognition possible.

Informed consent from the participants was a required condition for obtaining permission to gather data. This was taken care of in the following way: The participants were informed that they were taking part in a linguistics related study, focusing on immigration. They were informed about how the recordings were made and how they were going to be transcribed. They were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary and that they could step down from the study at any point, have the recordings erased with no questions to be asked. They were also informed that their identity would be made anonymous in the transcriptions through pseudonyms. Later, written information on the project and a “informed consent” schema were sent to all participants through an email, as a word document attachment, later signed and returned to the researcher. A copy of this letter and of the informed consent schema are attached in the Appendixes C and D.

3.7 The researcher as an insider

Working with data obtained through interviews, fieldwork, or other types of interactions with informants always raises questions regarding the relationship between researcher and informant. Labov's (1972a) formulation of the Observer's Paradox resumes the problem as that of the effect of systematic observation on the informants' behavior and the validity of the observations made.

Working with a group in which the researcher is a member implies several advantages and disadvantages. Among the advantages one can list the extensive knowledge of the group the researcher already has, as well as an advantage for building trust with the participants and generating a good environment for the interview. Among the disadvantages, there is the risk of creating an artificial situation when the insider takes the role of the observer, along with the problematic position an in-group member has when interpreting and analyzing data. Nevertheless, arguing that the insider position of the researcher is radically different from that of any researcher implies a positivist perception of research as something that can be carried out with absolute objectivity. Current work on sociolinguistic methodology challenges this assumption, since

The researcher's own identity, including his or her particular interests, will greatly influence the research agenda....What is important is that the researcher be aware of her / his ideological influences on the aims and objectives of the research and how this potentially influences the data. (Lanza 2008: 75-77)

In this sense, all research is under risk of being biased by the personal interests and characteristics of the researcher, from the formulation of the research questions to the definition in the analysis of what is relevant and what is not. In the concrete case of gathering linguistic data through interviews, Talmy (2011) points to the inscription of interviews as part of social praxis, as both the interviewer and participant are equally engaged in the production of the interaction that will later constitute the material for the analysis. In this sense, the interview is a collaborative achievement between participants and "data contamination" due to the researcher's participation in the interview is not a problem, Talmy argues, as her or his involvement in the interview *is* part of the data. A clear example of the influence of the researcher in the interaction is Victor A narrative (see the Appendix and the analysis of this narrative in Chapter 4), in which Victor attempts to make a generalized account of several experiences while I, the moderator, press Victor into narrating one particular experience, that is, producing a narrative of

personal experience. There are several conversational sequences in the narrative where the participants and I negotiate the type of response that was desirable in that context, and actively co-construct the narrative. In order to address this influence of the researcher on the data, these passages are transcribed and analyzed from an interactional perspective, and the moderator's role in the interview is analyzed as one of the participants.

Baynham (2006: 378) specifically points out the relevance of these issues in relation to work on identity and categorization in narratives, since the identities ascribed to and assumed by the researcher in the interview affect the performance of the informants and how they construct their identities in interaction. As identity is negotiated and constructed, the presence of the researcher as a participant in the interaction necessarily affects the range of categories available to the participants and their positioning towards these, as other categorization is intrinsic to self categorization. In this thesis, the researcher can be identified, categorized as part of the same group as the participants she works with: as a Spanish-speaking Latin American migrant to Oslo. In this sense, the categorizations and positionings that emerged in the interview can be said to stem from a homogeneous group, thus the data truly represent an in-group perspective. Such a perspective contributes to creating a natural environment for the emergence of self and other categorization, as the participants' homogenous background makes the interview a safe environment for expressing opinions and judgments of in- and out- members in the process of negotiating group identities. Moreover, the setting of the interview in Spanish with a Norwegian bilingual context also available to all stressed the group feeling, thus allowing participants to assume shared experiences and common stands on social matters, and using this as a ground to build their arguments on. This is evident in the switches to Norwegian to refer to legislation on migration procedures, names of institutions, etc., as it will be shown in the analysis.

It should, however, be kept in mind that the insider's perspective is not a necessary condition for data-gathering on categorization and identity construction of migrant groups, as De Fina (2000, 2003, 2006) has thoroughly proven. Nonetheless it should be pointed out that De Fina resorted to her knowledge of Spanish and Mexican culture after years of living in Mexico City, along with her experiences as an Italian immigrant in the U.S.A., in order to get in touch with, and build, a relationship with her informants, thus gaining an insider's perspective through ethnographic work.

3.8 The corpus of narratives for the analysis

Narrative is a well-established and widely used unit of analysis in linguistic research, as already argued in Chapter 2. In this thesis, I selected a corpus consisting of seven narratives in order to perform the analysis of self and other categorization. I will now present the operational definition used for identifying the narratives, the selection criteria applied for determining the corpus for the analysis, and the corpus that is to be analyzed in the following Chapter 4, Analysis.

The criterion used to identify narratives in the corpus was Labov's (1972) canonical definition, though interpreted in Ochs and Capps' (2001) terms of narrative dimensions, as shown in Table 1. In short, I selected narratives that were closer to the canonical definition of narrative, but the selection was not exclusively limited to these, as I maintained an interactional approach to narrative analysis that conceives of it in functional, gradient terms rather than through a structural, clear cut definition. In this sense, I analyze narratives that have predominantly one teller, present rather highly tellable events, are both embedded in and detached from surrounding conversation, present some form of temporal progression though not necessarily linear, and at moments introduce a certain moral stance (cf. 2.3.2). This selection of narratives was done in order to limit the corpus for the analysis, since it would have been difficult to define limits for the material to be analyzed if *small stories* and other forms of narrative discourse were included. Moreover, canonical narratives are more easily identifiable and there is a considerable amount of research done on narrative, much of it focusing on Spanish narratives (Silva-Corvalan 1983; Koike 1996; Carranza 1998). In addition, researchers in the field of narrative and identity studies, and narrative and migration (e.g. De Fina 2003; Baynham 2006) often operate with Labov's canonical definition of narrative, thus analyzing a type of material similar to these studies allows me to contrast my analysis to this previous research.

With this working definition of narrative, I found approximately 13 examples of canonical or almost canonical narratives. I use the term "approximately" because some narratives emerged embedded in, or as part of other narratives, or in some cases, two stories were told as a response to a question from the moderator and are to some extent dependant on each other but still identifiable as stories of two different events.

	<i>Susana</i>	<i>Victor</i>	<i>Juana</i>
Narratives	5	4	4

Table 2: Narratives distributed according to participant

Having identified the narratives that emerged in the interview, I conducted a preliminary analysis. Early in this process I found out that it was possible to establish thematic classifications of the narratives, on rather intuitive terms. Researchers working with narrative and identity often categorize narratives thematically for their analysis. Relaño Pastor (2010: 88) focuses on “fitting in” narratives of migrant background students in Madrid’s schools, while De Fina and King (2011) and Relaño Pastor and De Fina (2005) focus on “language conflict” narratives, that is narratives in which antagonists used the lack of competence in English as the basis to insult or humiliate the Spanish-speaking Latin American protagonists. Holmes (2006: 169) analyzes workplace narratives as stories that are “essentially digressions from the business talk which constitutes the core of workplace interaction,” whereas Baynham (2006) works with migration and settlement narratives of Moroccan immigrants in London. Finally De Fina (2008: 424) works with narratives of Italian stories in an Italian-American card playing club which are “topically linked” as they are indexical of “Italianness”.

In my data, I found that the narratives could be classified into types of situations, or settings, presented in the story worlds, that is, the narrated world or universe in which the narrated events take place:

- narratives of job interviews
- narratives of arrival and first time in Norway
- narratives of service and institutional encounters
- narratives of Norwegian courses

In these settings the characters fulfill roles stipulated in a particular setting: interviewer, job applicant, clerk, coworker, etc. The first category of job interview narratives seems a narrow one, but due to the amount of examples of narratives of the job interview settings a category of its own was necessary to address both the saliency of the topic and the repetitions across experiences. Narratives of arrival is a transparent category; it includes stories of when and why the participants migrated to Norway and about their first time in

the country. The narratives of service and institutional encounters includes narratives of interactions related to purchases (such as at a shop) and of interactions in institutionalized settings (health services, the police, and so on). The setting of the narrative is often introduced in the orientation section of the narrative (cf. 2.3.1), which is the section in which narrators introduce information on the location, participants and general relevant background information. The orientation introduces a type of setting that creates expectations regarding the roles of the characters, the type of events to be depicted, and the actions that are proper for the roles, among others. According to this classification of the narratives, I saw that there was an imbalance in the production of the types of narratives, as some participants told no job interview stories, or no institutional and service encounters. Table 3 shows the distribution of narrative types according to narrator:

	<i>Susana</i>	<i>Victor</i>	<i>Juana</i>
Job interview	1	2	–
Arrival	2	1	1
S/I encounters	–	1	2
Norwegian course	1	–	1
Work	1	–	–

Table 3: Distribution of narrative types according to narrator

This distribution might be related to the different individual experiences of each participant, as some might have been to many job interviews in Norway, while others were not, for example.

Some of the narratives were more interesting to my analysis than others. Since the goals of this thesis included assessing participants' use of categories and consequent positionings at the levels of the interaction I decided to focus on the narratives that presented the most categorizations, that were the most evaluated by narrators and participants, and those that were actively co-constructed by other participants as they became involved in the arguments presented in the narrative. These narratives were the types *institutional and service encounters*, and *job interviews*. It could be argued that this is because these narratives presented potential conflict situations and thus were highly

evaluated by narrators and triggered involvement in the other participants; this will be discussed in Chapter 4, Analysis.

As a result of these choices, the corpus was narrowed down to a selection of seven narratives: three *job interview* narratives, three *service and institutional encounter* narratives, and one classified as a *work* narrative, which introduces a narrative of a job situation among co-workers. I decided to include this last narrative because it introduced an interesting perspective on how Latin Americans categorize themselves in relation to other migrant groups, and because it was told as a “second story” (Sacks 1992), that is as a response, to an institutional encounter narrative and will be analyzed along with it.

Table 4 shows a list of the narratives that compose the corpus, presented by speaker, type of story, and reference name:

Type of story	Reference name, with the name of the participant
<i>Job interview</i>	Victor B
	Susana B
	Victor C
<i>I/S encounter</i>	Juana A
	Victor A
	Susana A (<i>work</i>)
	Juana B

Table 4: Corpus of narratives by title and type

In the following chapter, I will present the analysis of this corpus, where I will present excerpts from the narratives as I analyze them. The narratives will be presented in two sections: job interview (cf. 4.1) and institutional and service encounters (cf. 4.2). I will also analyze the conversational contexts in which the narratives emerge, as these are relevant for the study of participants’ positionings towards the narratives told as well as the other participants. The narratives will be presented in excerpts and not always in their complete versions, due to space constraints. For a full version of the narratives in Spanish with a corresponding English translation, see the Appendix A.

3.9 Conclusion

I have now presented the data that constitutes the corpus of this thesis as well as detailed a detailed description of the methods for gathering the data (the interview, the participants, the transcription.) These choices were discussed and argued for in the light of previous research and of my own research questions. Particular attention was given to the role of the researcher as an insider and to the selection of the corpus of narratives that constitutes the corpus, since these two methodological steps have important implications for the nature of the data and the analysis.

We will now turn to the analysis and discussion of the corpus. In the following chapter, I will focus on the group categories used in the narratives by applying De Fina's analytical model of identity construction and categorization in narratives (cf. 2.3.3) to my data.

4 Analysis

This thesis focuses on identity construction strategies at the individual level, in the situated interaction among participants and in relation to self and other categorization through the use of group categories. The research questions the analysis seeks to answer are the following:

- How do participants construct individual identities in interaction through the use of group categories in narratives of personal experience?
 - Which categories and category labels do Latin Americans use to refer to themselves and others in narratives of personal experience?
 - Which presupposed, shared meanings are assigned to the categories used in the narratives?
 - How do participants position themselves in relation to the categorizations presented in the narratives?

In order to address these questions, I will apply De Fina's (2003: 8) analytical model of identity construction in narrative. This model considers both the interactional, locally situated aspects of identity as negotiated among participants, as well as the schematic, socially shared representations of group identities. This approach can thus provide with the analytical tools needed to address the research questions of the project. I will analyze the discourse resources deployed in the narratives for identifying characters through the use of group category labels and action sequences presented in the stories (De Fina 2003), and through the analysis of the stances participants take in relation to these identifications, through quoting different voices (Tannen 2007), using contrasting verbal tempus (Carranza 1998), and shifting pronouns (De Fina 2003).

In the analyses, categorization will be considered a *discourse strategy* (Gumperz 1982), a linguistic resource systematically used in a manner that creates involvement, that is, engagement among participants in the interaction (Tannen 2007). Categories are inferentially rich linguistic items (cf. 2.2.1) and thus are maximally efficient in communication (Grice 1975). They create involvement and engage interlocutors, as they

allow narrators to infer the implicit meaning of categories by themselves, causing the evaluation or point of the narrative to have more rhetorical force (Johannesson 1998).

Nevertheless, a clarification regarding the use of De Fina's model for the analysis of my data is required. De Fina (2003; 2006) deals with the schematic representations of group categories from an in-group perspective and traces how these categories are presented and negotiated in the narratives of members of the group. In order to assess the level of schematic or cognitive representations of categories, De Fina works with large corpora of interviews with several members of the group in focus, Mexican undocumented immigrants to the U.S.A., gathered over a longer period of time. However, in a later study of identity in an Italian American card-playing club, De Fina (2008) introduces the study of shared stereotypes on group categories as a means of assessing the macro social context of narratives, consisting of public discourses and perceptions regarding an ethnic group. De Fina does not operate with a specific definition of stereotypes, but she does establish that stereotypes regarding ethnic groups are socially shared representations and are thus often implied in narratives. The data to be analyzed in the present project is less in quantity and has a narrower representation of the group than De Fina's (2003) and (2006) works. Nevertheless, De Fina's (2008) work on stereotypes shows us the possibility of assessing the aspects of presupposed and implicit knowledge within group categories even at the smaller scale of the material available for this project.

Based on De Fina's work, stereotypes can be considered as closely related to group categories; as group categories entail stereotypes so that the uses of category labels which contradict the stereotypes implied in them require "repairs" or specifications of the type: "she is Norwegian but she can't ski", or "he is Latino but can't dance", with skiing and dancing as stereotypical category bound activities for Norwegians and Latinos respectively. However, it should be kept in mind that stereotypes are not equal to De Fina's notion of "schematic representations of group identities" as they have a higher conventionalized status as *images* or *beliefs* (Amossy and Pierrot 2001). Nonetheless, stereotypes are in fact socially shared cognitive representations of social groups. In the analysis, the shared representations of categories are assessed through the notion of stereotypes, as socially shared, reductionist representations of the characteristics, attributes and behavior of social groups that usually, but not always, have negative or pejorative connotations. Regarding the identification of categories and categorizations, I

resort to some of the analytical tools of CA, and the study of MCD (cf. 2.2.1), more specifically to the notion of *category bound activity*.

The analysis of the narratives is done following Ochs and Capps (2001) dimensional approach, since it allows us to address a broader material and to focus on the interactional aspects of narratives. Nevertheless, Labov's structural account of narrative remains current and provides a set of analytical units that are helpful in the analysis, as argued in Chapter 2. The narratives are presented in two sections, *job interview* and *institutional and service encounters* narratives.

4.1 The job interview narratives

In the preliminary analysis of the data, I discovered several examples of job interview narratives. This was surprising, since there were no questions designed to elicit this specific type of narratives (see the Appendix B), and while employment was a topic of conversation stipulated in the questions, job interviews were not thematized per se.

4.1.1 Victor B

Victor's *job interview* narrative emerged after a heated exchange among the participants, elicited by the question: "how do you think Norwegians see you?" (lines 01-04). The Moderator proposed a set of category terms that might have been relevant to describe the group of participants: immigrants, Latinos, Peruvian, Mexican, and Chilean. The answer then evolved into a discussion on social stereotypes, and how Latinos were perceived in Norway, as Juana provided an interesting perspective on the role and categorization of Latinos (lines 05-25).

01	M	(00.37.41) cómo cómo creen que los noruegos los ven a ustedes, (.) o sea cómo:	01	M	(00.37.41) how how do you think Norwegians see you, (.) I mean ho:w
02		no sé si piensa como <u>inmigrante</u> o como <u>latino</u> o: como peruano mexicano chileno que -	02		I dunno if one thinks like <u>immigrant</u> or like <u>Latino</u> or like Peruvian Mexican Chilean what
03		no sé qué qué qué creen ustedes que ellos ven en en ustedes,	03		I dunno what what what do you think that they see in you,
04		ahí de una manera superficial no,	04		like in a superficial manner right,
05	J	yo la verdad em- muchas veces me pregunto eso	05	J	I actually e- wonder about this often
06		porque como no caemos en la categoría de los musulmanes, (S: <u>mhm</u>)	06		because since we do not fall in the category of Muslims, (S: <u>mhm</u>)
07		>no te ves musulmán.<	07		>you don't look Muslim.<

08		pero tampoco te ves noruego, y:	08		but you don't look like a Norwegian either, a:nd
09		y no te ve- osea te escuchan y es español	09		and they see- I mean they hear you and it's Spanish
10		y entonces eh- como que le tienen un poco más de [respeto] al español	10		and then e- like they have a bit more [respect] for Spanish
11	S	[sí]	11	S	yes
12	J	porque (.) finalmente es un idioma:=	12	J	because (.) it is actually a language: =
13	S	=que les gusta a ellos=	13	S	=which they like=
14	J	=europeo o medio muy popular	14	J	=a European language or kind of popular
15		entonces como que no saben en donde ponerte	15		then like they don't know where to place you
16		en qué categoría ponerte, no,	16		in which category to place you, right,
17		eh: entonces es como - (1.8)	17		eh: then it's li:ke - (1.8)
18		n:o sé no -	18		I dunno: no -
19		yo <u>quisiera</u> saber qué qué es lo que piensan pero: a mí no m- n...	19		I would like to know what it is that they think bu:t to me no
20		digo fuera de esas pocas experiencias @ con gente no tan agradable @	20		I mean besides those few experiences @ with less than pleasant people @
21		pues n- no sé no, en que c- no sé qué es lo que piensan. (0.6) °realmente (0.9)	21		well I don- don't know what they think (0.6) actually (0.9)
22		porque no: me pueden poner en una categoría (M: mhm) de las que tienen esas preestablecidas (S: mhm)	22		because they can't place me into a preestablished category (M: mhm) that they have (S: mhm)
23		que si o estás dentro o estás fuera,	23		in which you're either in or out of it,
24		y como no estás en ninguna de las dos	24		and since you are in neither of those
25		entonces (.) eres algo pues un poco <u>exó:tico</u> : [y:]	25		then (.) you are something rather <u>exo:tic</u> [a:nd]
26	S	[sí]	26	S	[yes]
27	V	yo creo que eso ahí yo creo que por ahí va porque [osea en el]=	27	V	I think that's in the direction (that the answer lays) because [I mean in the]=
28	S	[sí]	28	S	[yes]

Juana's perspective on the general position of Latin Americans is that of an "uncategorizable" group, as they do not belong into the antagonist groups: *Norwegians* and *Muslims*. Interestingly, the aspects or characteristics that provide Latinos with the uncategorizable position is that of their physical aspect (line 07), along with their language (lines 09-14), which is ranged higher in prestige than other immigration languages, as it is a European language. Victor is very responsive to Juana's formulation on the uncategorizable and thus "exotic" image of Latinos (line 25) as he takes the turn (line 27), winning over Susana who also overlapped with Victor in her attempt to prose an answer. Victor interprets this image in relation to expectations regarding "Latino behavior" according to in-group shared stereotypes and cultural icons. Social categorization would then happen on the basis of these stereotypes and expectations:

29	V	=en el cas- en los casos ma:s <u>bizarros</u> o sea (.) el tipo que siempre: (.) <u>caricaturiza</u> : a la persona que está conociendo, entonces no sé si: s- (1.2)	29	V	=in the most <u>bizarre</u> cases I mean (.) the guy always makes a <u>caricaturization</u> of the person he is getting to know, then I don't know if (1.2)
30		si ve un <u>argentino</u> , tiene que ser como <u>Maradona</u>	30		if he sees an <u>Argentine</u> , he has to be like <u>Maradona</u> (football player)

31	o tiene que ser un <u>gaucho</u> . meentiendes,	31	or has to be like a <u>gaucho</u> (cowboy). you know,
32	si ve un <u>mexicano</u> , tiene que ser [un <u>charro</u> .] meentiendes, (S: mhm)	32	if he sees a Mexican, he has to be [a <u>charro</u>] youknow, (S:mhm)
33	J [xxx sombrero sí]	33	J [xxx sombrero]
34	V y es como un poco eso es como	34	V and is like
35	“ah pero tú no eres pero ere:s mexicano pero no no -	35	“oh but you are a Mexican but you don’t don’t -
36	S °si no pero=	36	S °yes but=
37	V = noeres un charro no andas con pistolo:nes” nosé una cosa =	37	V =you are not a charro with big pistols” I mean a thing=
38	M = qué recuerdas que te hayan dicho [algo] como:	38	M = do you remember someone telling you [something] li:ke
39	V [sí]	39	V [yes]
40	sí me lo [dijeron. en una entrevista de traba:jo]	40	yes they [told me at a job interview]
41	S [no pero es cierto. “pero tú no tienes] plumas”= @@	41	S [no but that’s true. “but you don’t wear] feathers (on your forehead)= @@
42	M =que pero qué qué te qué te acuerdas de algo: =	42	M =but what what what do you remember something
43	V =sí [me dijeron]	43	V =yes [they told me]
44	M una situación en concreto,	44	M one concrete situation

With this exchange as the immediate context, and by the request of the Moderator who asks for a particular experience (lines 38, 42 and 44), Victor introduces a highly evaluated job interview narrative (lines 45-164). A long orientation section (cf. 2.3.1) presents background information for the narrative and functions as an introduction (lines 45-53). The categories *noruego* “Norwegian” and *extranjero* “foreigner” are presented as relevant to the introduction of the characters in the narrative:

45	V (00:39:36) sí me dijero:n (1.1)	45	V (00:39:36) yes I remember I was told (1.1)
46	me acuerdo en una entrevista de trabajo, en la que ya era: era la <u>última</u> entrevista	46	I remember in a job interview, that wa:s was the <u>last</u> interview
47	y habíamos dos pers-	47	and we were two peop-
48	quedábamos solo yo y otr- y un noruego, (.)	48	there was only me and anoth- and a Norwegian left, (.)
49	para conseguir el trabajo y (0.8)	49	for getting the job and (0.8)
50	y en esa ocasión me tocó hablar con (.) con el dueño: (1.35)	50	and on that occasion I had to talk to the owner (1.35)
51	con el socio <u>económico</u> osea el <u>capitalista</u> de la empresa,	51	to the <u>financial</u> partner I mean the <u>investor</u> of the company
52	el que era el <u>dueño</u> de la empresa, (1.5) y:	52	the one who was the <u>owner</u> of the company, (1.5) a:nd
53	y él estaba super preocupado de que yo entrara. @@	53	and he was really worried that I might get the job. @@
54	me di cuenta meentiendes,	54	I realized youknow,
55	osea era una empresa en la que no había <u>ningún</u> extranjero	55	I mean it was a company where there weren’t <u>any</u> foreigners
56	yo habría sido el primero (.)	56	I would have been the first one (.)
57	y él estaba muy preocupado.(.)	57	and he was really worried. (.)

Victor was one of the two candidates for the job who had made it to the last interview in the application process, along with a Norwegian man. Victor hesitates while presenting the character of the other applicant in lines 47 and 48: from “we were two people” that gives the impression of the characters being peers, to a more differentiated “me and another” that still implies an equal status for the characters; to finally “me and a Norwegian” which clearly sets apart both characters: one categorized as Norwegian, the other implicitly identified as non-Norwegian. This reformulation can be seen as part of the narrator’s involvement, engagement with his own memories, and as an effort to remain true to them. Tannen (2007: 138-9) argues that the use of detail in narrative can not only indicate involvement from the part of the narrator, but also creates involvement in the narrative’s audience. In the case of Victor’s narrative, the effort put in categorizing the characters in a specific manner not only creates involvement in the participants, but it is also relevant to the construction of the narrative, as we will soon see.

De Fina (2003) singles out the strategic use of categories in the orientation of narratives as potentially relevant to the interactional situation in which the narrative emerges and/or the story world of the narrative. Categorization in narrative is often related to generalizations about social groups argued in conversation, so the identification of characters in the story world as belonging to this or that group are actually indicative of more general arguments about the behavior and values of social groups (De Fina 2003: 151; 2006: 356). In the case of this narrative, Victor’s use of the category labels *extranjero* “foreigner” and *noruego* “Norwegian” seems to be relevant to both contextual levels of discourse: the narrative and the interactional level. The interview talk prior to the narrative was about categorization and how Latinos were perceived in Norway, and Victor produced a narrative that argued his position on the subject. He signals the relevance of the narrative by the use of national categories: *noruego* and *extranjero*. Simultaneously, these categories are made relevant to the narrative action, by being presented as an explanatory factor for the course of actions: Victor realized that the owner was worried that Victor might get the job because there were no foreigners working at the company at that time, and Victor would have been the first one (lines 53-57). The fact that both the job applicant and the owner of the company were Norwegians is relevant to the story world as it explains the skepticism of the owner, and ultimately advances the outcome of the story. What is implicit here is the identification or perception of Victor as non-Norwegian or *extranjero*, in opposition to these characters.

The narrative action starts with the statement that the owner was worried, as already presented. In this instance Victor introduces the voice of the owner in an extremely indirect manner for vividly illustrating these concerns (lines 61-64), followed by an open evaluation and a new set of clauses in the voice of the owner (lines 68-72), this time in a more open reference.

60	V	osea el estaba realmente <u>miedoso</u> de mi:	60	V	I mean he was really <u>scared</u> of my: of me
		de mi condición de extranjero.			being a foreigner.
61		de que “de que yo podría tener otras	61		that “that I might have other <u>cu:stoms</u> ,
		<u>costu:mbres</u> ,			
62		de que yo podía ser <u>viole:nto</u> ,	62		that I could be <u>vi:olent</u> ,
63		de que yo podía- (.) cómo era mi	63		that I could- (.)how was my temper,
		temperamento,			
64		qué qué ea- ”	64		what what wea”
65		o sea el tipo estaba <u>tratando</u> en ese	65		I mean the guy was <u>trying</u> at that moment
		momento de la entrevista de trabajo,			of the job interview,
66		tratando de entender qué es lo que era (.)	66		trying to understand what it was (.) a
		un extranj-			foreign-
67		de entender qué es lo que es un	67		to understand what it is a foreigner. I mean
		extranjero. osea			
68		“este tipo se crio en la <u>selva</u> ,	68		“did this guy grow up in the <u>jungle</u> ,
69		mató <u>gente</u> . @	69		kill <u>people</u> . @
70		comió <u>monos</u> ,	70		eat <u>monkeys</u> ,
71		qué hizo este tipo ah,	71		what did this guy do ah,
72		qué es lo que hace,”	72		what does he do, ”

De Fina (2006: 371) defines *voicing devices* as the “linguistic and paralinguistic means through which a narrator weaves into his own narrating voice a polyphony of other voices representing different points of view on the events.” The notions of voice and polyphony are taken from Bakhtin ([1952-53] 1986), and refer to a notion of discourse or speech as imbued with previous uses, as utterances bear traces of other *voices*. In this particular case, Victor constructs the voice of the character of the owner in two passages (lines 61-64 and 68-72) by resorting to different voicing devices: through the use of prosodic cues (Günthner 1999) and *constructed dialogue* (Tannen 2007). In the first passage, Victor makes an implicit reference to the owner’s voice as the source of these concerns and he indexes this reference by using distinct prosodic cues for signaling the introduction of other voices. The elongation of the vowels of the final words of the clauses in combination with a rising intonation in the final syllables, and accompanied by a change in volume, create the impression of a voice distinct from that of the narrator. A reference to other’s voice is not always marked by the use of *verba dicendi*, or changes in the use of tempus; and is often incorporated in the narrator’s voice as a “concealed form of polyphony” (Günthner 1999) The reference to the owner’s voice in lines 61-64 is thus

implicit, indexed by the prosodic cues of volume, duration and intonation of words. Moreover, the repetition of similar phrase-structures in *de que* “that I” with a variable verb in conditional (could) + modifier/object construction (lines 61-63), creates the impression of an enumeration, supported also by the use of a list-like intonation. According to Tannen (2007: 75), this type of repetition with variation, in the case of Victor’s narrative, the repetition of the subordinated phrases, creates the impression that the owner was making the same type of comments or asking the same questions again and again.

Victor takes an evaluative pause from the narrative action in lines 65-67, where he states the intentions of the owner by asking particular background questions: “the guy was trying to understand what a foreigner was about”. He then returns to the action by introducing the voice of the owner in a new passage. This time, the owner’s voice takes the form of an inner monologue, a hypothetical mental conversation where the character of the owner externalizes his thoughts. This passage (lines 68-72) in the voice of the owner is what Tannen (2007: 112) defines as *constructed dialogue*, “[c]asting ideas as dialogue rather than statements is a discourse strategy for framing information in a way that communicates effectively and creates involvement”. This concept stresses the constructed nature of reported speech in conversation and narrative, since it conceives of it as a discursive resource, “an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered” (p. 129).

Hence the passage of inner dialogue illustrates the nature of constructed dialogue as different from the idea of quotation, since it is not possible to postulate that this passage was ever “thought” by the owner. It serves the function of the evaluating this character, expressing Victor’s stance regarding the Norwegian. Constructed dialogue is what Labov (1972b: 372) called an embedded form of evaluation, as it introduces the narrator’s perspective on the narrated events but does not disrupt the dramatic continuity of the narrative. The second passage of constructed dialogue introduces an ironic Tarzan-like depiction of Victor (growing up in the jungle, killing people, eating monkeys). Juana’s previous account of the experience of being categorized in Norway introduced the formulation of Latinos as *exotic*. The category *exotic* is connected to a Eurocentric perception of other cultures as *primitive* and *savage*, and to the idea of *exotic* travel

destinations where *exotic* cultures live. Victor exploits these connections for constructing an ironic image of the owner (and ultimately Norwegian men) as little knowledgeable and not used to dealing with people from different cultural backgrounds: Victor was different, *exotic*, thus potentially a *savage*. The ironic representation of the owner's voice continues in a new passage of externalized thought, this time in the form of questions that imply another stereotype regarding Latino men: the *macho*.

74	V	osea para él <u>todo lo que era yo</u> era algo misterioso y como una incógnita	74	V	I mean to him <u>everything about me</u> was something mysterious and a sort of mystery
75		así como (.)	75		something like (.)
76		“¿qué hará,	76		”“what does he do,
77		no sé le pegará a su mujer (M:mhm)	77		I don't know does he hit his wife (M:mhm)
78		qué hará”	78		what does he do,”
79		no sé me entiendes	79		I don't know you know
80		como “qué qué cómo actuara	80		like “what what how would he react
81		qué e- qué es lo que pasará cuando yo le diga:	81		what what would happen if I tell him:
82		‘oye tienes que hacer este trabajo.’	82		‘hey you have to do this job.’
83		me pegará,” (.)	83		will he hit me,”
84		entonces es- así eran las preguntas.	84		the it was- the questions were like that.
85		era como un poco	85		it was like a bit

Victor marks the voice of the owner by a switch in the voice quality he uses to introduce these clauses: he lowers his voice to enact the owner's inner thoughts as he wondered about how Victor was actually like. Latinos can stereotypically be depicted as *machos*. Stereotypical, chauvinistic macho-men do not respect women's rights, and are abusive towards their partners. He uses the image of a wife-beating macho-man to draft some potential risks a man of these characteristics might present to a Norwegian employer: A macho, abusive man can also disrespect authority at the work place and become violent when frustrated. In line 87-90, after a short interruption from the moderator that is dismissed by Victor, who continues the narrative, the tension of the narrative action escalates;

86	M	qué te preg- qué-	86	M	what did he ask- wha-
87	V	entonces yo yo me empezab- yo me empecé a b- a chorear,	87	V	then I I was start- I started to g- to get angry,
88		porque: la entrevista de trabajo nunca se trato del tema profesional.	88		beca:use the job interview was never about professional questions.
89		yo trataba de llevar la la la entrevista de trabajo a (.) cuál habían sido mis experiencias de trabajo,	89		I would try to lead the the the interview towards (.) my previous work experiences,
90		y el <u>siempre</u> cambiaba el tema de de la entrevista (.) hacia mi: (.) hacia mi:	90		and he would <u>always</u> change the topic of the interview back (.) to my: (.) to my

	condición de extranjero.		status as a foreigner.
91	osea “ya. que el <u>idio:ma</u>	91	I mean “there. the <u>la:nguage</u>
92	que de dónde <u>vie:nes</u>	92	that where you <u>co:me from</u>
93	que si vas a viajar a <u>Chi:le</u>	93	that if you'll be traveling to <u>Chi:le</u>
94	que si tu familia viene <u>pa acá:”</u>	94	that if your family comes <u>he:re”</u>
95	osea (.) era- no tenía <u>nada que ver</u> con el	95	I mean (.) it wa- it <u>had nothing to do</u> with
	trabajo mismo		the job itself
96	entonces <u>era todo el rato</u> era eso	96	then it was like that <u>all the time</u>

Victor introduces in line 87 the second action assigned to himself in the story world: getting angry. Again, Victor's character is presented as an experiential subject, rather than an agentive one, by being assigned only stative verbs (feel, think, etc.) instead of dynamic. He reports getting mad because of the tenor and topics of the questions of the owner, since they did not deal with professional qualifications and are therefore inappropriate for a job interview context. The third action assigned to Victor in the narrative is that of trying to lead the owner of the company towards a conversational topic that he considered relevant: his previous work experience and education (line 89). This concrete action, carried by an agentive subject this time, failed repeatedly when the owner insisted on returning to topics that had to do Victor's "status as a foreigner". Victor stresses the cyclical aspect of the action by using Spanish past imperfect and the adverb "siempre" *always* as a modifier: (Imperfect in bold, adverb underlined): "yo **trataba** de llevar la la la entrevista de trabajo a (.) cuál habían sido mis experiencias de trabajo / y él siempre **cambiaba** el tema de de la entrevista (.) hacia mi: (.) hacia mi condición de extranjero," "I **would try** to lead the interview towards (.) my previous work experience / and he **would** always **change** the topic of the interview (.) back to my (.) to my status as a foreigner." (lines 45-6). Past imperfect is one of the two synthetic forms for past tense in Spanish, along with the single past. What distinguishes these two forms is mainly aspect, simple past being perfective while Imperfect, imperfective, or durative. Past imperfect marks the action of the verb as persistent and with no precise end (Alarcos Llorach 1994), and it is therefore used to introduce repeated or habitual events in narrative, or actions that are background to other actions (Silva-Corvalan 1983). Carranza (1998) analyzes the use of Spanish past imperfect in narratives for depicting habitual actions. She calls these narratives "low-narrativity narratives", since they do not follow the canonical narrative structure in which the actions follow a linear temporal order (cf. 2.3.1). In non-prototypical, habitual narratives, the use of past Imperfect creates a static picture of the past:

The textual effect of segments about habitual actions or continuous states is to build a holistic picture of the past that speaks for itself. As a consequence, the argumentative dimension of this effect is to make the propositions and evaluations contained in the segment harder to challenge. (Carranza 1998: 305)

Past imperfect (henceforth PI) then, can function as an argumentative tool in the narrative. The strategic use of PI in Victor's narrative helps building the narrative tension by presenting a static, generalized impression of the job interview, where the owner was only interested in Victor's foreign background and not on his professional qualifications. In spite of Victor's efforts in affecting the course of action, the interview unfolds in the same manner. This image of the interview, as a continuous, repetitive succession of the same type of questions, is much more effective than a punctual narration of concrete questions in simple past, since it creates the effect of an overwhelming situation. The use of imperfect, along with the intonation and vowel elongation resource that we saw earlier, gives the impression of something that happened repeatedly to the point that becomes an uncomfortable situation.

The setting, or contextualization of the scene of the narrative as a job interview in the orientation creates expectations regarding the roles to be assigned to characters (interviewer, job applicant), the type of actions to be introduced (questions, answers), etc. Job interviews are among the most formal, standardized conversational encounters there is, as Akinasso and Ajirotutu (1982: 121) argue in their analysis of interethnic communication in job interview conversation. Job interviews are formalized discursive encounters with a "[f]ixed organizational structure and [a] strict allocation of rights and duties." There is a natural power unbalance to job interviews as a conversational genre, as the interviewer has the role of assigning the topics of discussion and signaling the proper place for changing them, marking when the interview starts and ends, etc., while the job applicant has the role of responding to the questions proposed with the objective of making a good impression and showing proficiency in the area in order to obtain the job. In this sense, the sequence of actions of the narrative seems to match the expected roles for the participants of a job interview and fulfills the expectations of the setting. The topics of discussion proposed by the interviewer on the other hand, do not follow what is expected of a job interview setting, and Victor's use of tempus evaluates this as inappropriate.

Immediately after, Victor introduces the *most reportable event* of the narrative (Labov 2010), which is presented as the peak of tension in the narrative sequence, and it appears introduced in Simple Past and thus marking a contrast with the previous section in PI.

97	V	entonces ya al final me dijo	97	V	then at the end he told me
98		“bueno pero <u>ustedes</u> lo (.) los latinos tienen: tienen (1.1) ese temperamento como de:	98		“well but <u>you</u> (.) Latinos have: (1.1) that temper of li:ke
99		°cómo fue que dijo,	99		°what did he say,
100		entonces ahí dijo algo así como de: (.) como de <u>charro</u> o una cosa así como”	100		then there he said something like a (.) <u>charro</u> (mexican cowboy) temper or something like”
101		se imaginó un: [un cowboy] me entiendes @@	101		he pictured himself a: [a cowboy] you know @@
102	S	[un macho]	102	S	[a macho]

Here the category *Latino* is introduced in the narrative, in the voice of the owner. This is one of the few accounts of the use of the category label *latino* in the interview, and the only one in a narrative. The introduction of constructed dialogue is clearly signaled by a quotation verb in simple past (*dijo* “said”), and indexicalized by a change in the quality of the voice of the narrator: really low volume to introduce this voice. These resources create a contrast between the narrative voice and the voice of the owner, and signal that Victor is distancing himself from the ascription of the category Latino to himself. Moreover, the use of the plural second person *ustedes* with an emphatic tone in the ascription of the category stresses the antagonism between the characters in the story world, the *noruego* and the *latino*. This distance is stressed even further by the ironical depiction of the voice through the use of hyperbolic images. This character asks about Victor’s temper (line 98), which is made relevant to the job interview situation in the story world in relation to the category *Latino*. This connection implicitly states the stereotype ‘Latinos are temperamental’ as a fact, and therefore as something that needs to be addressed in a job-interview context. Victor ridicules this stereotype by introducing the exaggerated images of a Charro (a Mexican cowboy), a cowboy and a macho. Instead of contradicting, or acting out as offended, Victor deconstructs the stereotype through the hyperbole.

This passage where the complicating action is introduced is highly evaluated by the use of voices, that give more dramatic tension to the story and create involvement (Tannen 2007) in the other participants, so that these not only support Victor’s narrative through back-channeling, and minimal responses, but also collaborate in co-constructing it:

103	V	entonces dijo así como (.)	103	V	then he said something like (.)
104		“qué va a pasar cuando: (.) cuando quéseyo eh- (0.8)	104		“what will happen whe:n (.) when Idunow eh: (0.8)
105		si algo te molesta te vas a parar- como onda te vas xxx”	105		if something bothers you are you gonna stand- like kind of will you xxx”
106		como que el tipo lo que estaba esperando era que me-	106		like what the guy expected from me was that I-
107		además me empezó a como a- a: =	107		besides he started like to- to: =
108	S	= a retar [así xxx]	108	S	= to challenge [like xxx]
109	V	[no no como] a retar pero como a provocar =	109	V	[no no like] to challenge but to provoke =
110	S	= a provocar ya	110	S	= to provoke yes
111	V	me estaba preo- me estaba provocando	111	V	he was preo- he was provoking me
112		el tipo lo que quería era que <u>justamente</u> yo (.)	112		what the guy wanted was <u>precisely</u> that I (.)
113		para así él él además[conformarse] consigo mismo	113		so that he he would also be [happy with] himself
114	S	[sí darse por xxx]	114	S	[yes to be xxx]
115	V	y decir	115	V	and say
116		“no en realidad este tipo no (.) <u>no puede</u> <u>ser</u>	116		“no this guy actually can't (.) <u>he can't be</u> <u>ser</u>
117		porque mira como se pone chachai (M: mhm) osea- no	117		because look how he reacts see (M: mhm) I mean no
118		no soporta que yo le <u>pregunte</u> (.) ah,”	118		he can't stand that I <u>ask</u> him (.) ah,”

Victor estimates that the reason for the owner challenging him was to get him to react aggressively, in order to confirm his own prejudices. He introduces this evaluation in the form of a hypothetical narrative (Carranza 1998: 296) of what might have happened if Victor had reacted. In lines 107-114 Victor introduces the action of the owner as “provoking” so that Victor would react. He then openly evaluates the action: the owner wanted Victor to react so that he could justify his assumption that Victor was not fitted for the job. Hypothetical narratives introduce evaluations about the main narrative by presenting a contrast between the hypothetic scenario and what is reported as actually happened in the story world (Carranza 1998: 291). Victor introduces another passage of constructed dialogue (116-118), where the owner expresses his satisfaction with the fact that Victor reacted (in the hypothetical story world) thus confirming his stereotypes. This hypothetical outcome presents a scenario where all the prejudices and concerns voiced as the owner’s are confirmed by Victor reacting aggressively. Victor does not introduce any action or reaction from his part in the story world, thus the point of the prejudices and behavior of the owner appear unjustified and unfair. The complexity in the use of evaluative devices is evident. This type of narrative structure and argumentative functions is addressable through Labov’s analytical categories (1972b), though such structures would never be considered narratives in Labov’s terms. This is the reason for conducting

an analysis that combines both a dimensional approach to narrative (Ochs and Capps 2001) with Labov's categories of narrative structure (cf. 2.3).

After this passage, an interesting evaluative segment is introduced in the voice of Victor:

120	V	y yo pensaba en ese momento,	120	V	and I was thinking in that moment,
121		yo yo pensaba hacia mis adentros.	121		I I was thinking in my head.
122		y decía (0.9)	122		and I was saying (0.9)
123		“este tipo me está preguntando sobre el <u>temperamento</u> .	123		this guy is asking me about my <u>temper</u> .
124		y yo creo <u>personalmente</u> que yo no he visto-”	124		and I <u>personally</u> believe that I haven't seen-”
125		o sea los noruegos son <u>sumamente temperamentales</u> .	125		I mean Norwegians have <u>strong tempers</u> .
126		osea un noruego tú no vienes a preguntarle a él	126		I mean you don't come to a Norwegian asking
127		que qué es lo que come,	127		what he eats,
128		ni que cómo hace,	128		nor how he does things,
129		ni que cómo huele,	129		nor how he smells,
130		porque el tipo va y te dice	130		because the guy would tell you
131		“qué mierda te está pasando,	131		“what the shit is wrong with you,
132		osea ubícate.	132		I mean get a grip.
133		qué me está preguntando,”	133		what are you asking me about,”
134		osea y eso no tiene que ver con el temperamento.	134		I mean and that has nothing to do with temper.
135		eso tiene que ver con el respeto.	135		that has to do with respect.
136		que es otra cosa.	136		which is another thing.
137		osea tú si si te faltan el respeto te t- tienes que poner al otro tipo en su lugar y punto	137		I mean you if if they disrespect you you need to put the other guy in his place period
138		y y el tipo	138		and and the guy
139		el tipo estaba siendo irrespetuoso conmigo en la en la entrevista de trabajo	139		the guy was disrespecting me at the job interview
140		y el tipo lo que creía era que yo me iba a parar arriba de la <u>mesa</u> y como a ponerme a zapatear	140		and the guy thought that I was going to stand on the <u>table</u> and start stomping on it
141		una cosa así así me entiendes,	141		something like that you know,

This fragment of constructed dialogue is the only one introduced in Victor's voice in the entire narrative (lines 123-136, approximately since it is difficult to draw the limits of voice construction in such an embedded passage). This is an example of an inner-dialogue that stops the narrative action and allows Victor to evaluate the situation, still speaking from within the story world. So far in the narrative, Victor has been portrayed as rather passive, only as an experiencer of feelings, or as a frustrated agent who tries to gain control over the interview but fails to do so repeatedly. Within this context in which he does not have power to influence the situation or voice, Victor creates a space for his own voice in the form of an inner dialogue, or externalized thought, in which he introduces a new stereotype: the Norwegian man. In this sense, the introduction of a hypothetical inner

dialogue is a strategy for not only evaluating the situation and the character of the Norwegian, but also for constructing an agentive role for himself. As Blommaert (2005) argues, voice is a form of agency, as having the possibility of making oneself understood. Having the chance to speak is not something available to all members of a community, as some might not know the majority language of the society in which they live, or would lack the conversational/communicative/orthographic knowledge required to make a contribution in a satisfactory manner in a particular context.

Victor returns implicitly to the stereotype of Latinos being temperamental by referring to the question about his temper (line 123). He continues deconstructing the Latino stereotype, this time by ascribing it to a generalized Norwegian, who is defined as temperamental. This claim is backed by the introduction of a moral stance in the voice of a hypothetical Norwegian (lines 131-133), who would have reacted insulted if he had been asked irrelevant questions at a job interview.

There are several contextual levels for understanding these phrases. In the immediate context of the narrative, they refer to questions asked in the context of a job interview discussed earlier. The introduction of the clauses of what a person eats, and how he smells can be indirectly referring to, and constructing a generalized experience of “othering”. The introduction of an inclusive second person *tú* “you” that asks the stereotypical Norwegian about his smells and habits introduces a generalized we, you and me, differentiated from the Norwegian.

The stereotypical Norwegian is then portrayed as temperamental, thus inverting the Latino stereotype. Nevertheless, Victor repairs this generalization immediately after: “that has to do with respect / which is another thing” (lines 135-136). In Victor’s narrated universe, a Norwegian would never tolerate being treated in that manner, which is not being temperamental but rather having self-respect and self-preservation. The stereotype temperamental was first ridiculed by the use of ironic hyperbolic images, then inverted by ascribing it to the category *Norwegian*, and ultimately re-interpreted to self-respect. Victor aligns himself with the stereotypical Norwegian and stands behind the moral values that now become shared. Victor is not stating that he is *Latino*, nor *Norwegian*, nor temperamental. He positions himself an individual beyond those categorizations.

What Victor constructs with the narrative is a complex line of argument in a narrative where he is presented in an impossible position: he is ascribed a category with a corresponding stereotype built on prejudices, but if he reacts and defends himself, he only risks confirming the prejudice. He resorts to a moral stance (Ochs and Capps 2001) that ultimately turns him against his own stereotype of Norwegians: it is not about temper, but about respect, dignity. At this point and almost closing the narrative, Susana interrupts to propose an alternative hypothetical end to it:

142	V	eso entonces como una caricaturización de [de tu condición]	142	V	then that's like a caricature of [of your status...]
143	S	[le hubieras mandado] un puñete [y punto (.) y nada]	143	S	[you should have] punched him in the face [period (.) and nothing]
144	V	[claro] eso es lo que] sí	144	V	[right] that's what] yes
145	S	y ahí terminabas tu @	145	S	and that was your end @
146	V	sí. eso era	146	V	yeah that was it
147		no [importaba nada de lo que]	147		no [it didn't matter any of what]
148	S	[eso es lo que él quería @]	148	S	[that's what he wanted @]
149	V	no importaba nada de lo que	149	V	it didn't matter anything of what
150		no importaba lo que yo había <u>estudia:do</u>	150		it didn't matter what I had <u>stu:died</u>
151		no importaba lo que yo había hecho nada	151		it didn't matter what I had done nothing
152		el tipo ahí estaba: como su primera experiencia con un extranjero de cierta manera	152		the guy was there: like (having) his first experience with a foreigner, in some way or another
153		por olv- (.)	153		by obl- (.)
154		yo creo que el tipo nol- no la quería era-	154		I think the guy didn- didn't want it-
155		por él ojalá se hubiese s- se hubiese ahorrado esa experiencia osea	155		he would've wished he could have spared himself from that experience I mean
156		yo llegue ahí <u>justamente</u> porque nunca me topé con él en todas las otras entrevistas osea no- =	156		I got there <u>precisely</u> because I never ran into him in all the previous interviews I mean no-=
157	M	=pero al final te te dio el trabajo	157	M	= but at the end he gave you the job...
158	V	<u>no no</u> . no me lo dio.	158	V	<u>no no</u> . he didn't give it to me.
159		no esto fue en otra empresa en una empresa anterior	159		no this was in another company at a previous company
160		que que era del mismo rubro de de TRABAJO	160		that that was in the same business of WORK
161		pero no ahí no quedé. (2.5)	161		but I didn't get it. (2.5)
162		llegué hasta la última ronda, pero:	162		I made it to the last (interview) round, but
163		cuando conocí al dueño capitalista de la empresa,	163		when I met the owner of the company,
164		ahí ya fracasó todo. @@ ah (exhales loudly)	164		there everything failed. @@@ ah (exhales loudly)

Susana suggests a comical alternative end to the narrative where Victor would have just punched the owner in the face and left the interview, with no job. It presents the scenario of the confirmation of the Latino stereotype and is introduced as a joke at the interactional level. Susana is taking a solidarity position towards Victor, by ironically validating the

stereotype and suggesting a violent end as something permitted or even desirable. She aligns herself with Victor's previous position as a Latino violent man: she mocks the stereotype sarcastically, by stating that such behavior is acceptable, expected for Latinos.

After this intervention, Victor repeats several open evaluations presented earlier in the narrative and stresses the fact that his qualifications or experience were not made relevant at the job interview, and that this was because the owner had already categorized him as a foreigner, and all the questions were directed to clarify what this implied. The narrative ends when the moderator assertively comments on what she assumes was the resolution of the narrative, that he got the job (line 157), to what Victor answers with an emphatic negation.

This narrative is first and foremost a narrative on ascribed categories, on how being recognized as within the category *Norwegian*, *foreigner* or *Latino* creates expectations about the behavior of that person. In this sense, categories operate as essentialist descriptions of a person (van Dijk 1984; De Fina 2006). A set of characteristics is usually assigned to the categories and an individual is expected to act according to those characteristics. In the story world of a narrative, categorization installs those expectations, as it refers to the schematic representations of what belonging to a category is about, but it still opens an arena for challenging or reformulating those assumptions. Victor explicitly challenges stereotypes about Latinos in the narrative, by taking ironic distance from the ascription of the category, and inverting the stereotypes to characterize the Norwegian character: he was violent, aggressive and disrespectful, in short a man that showed a strong temper. Still, towards the end of the narrative, he aligns himself with the values assigned to the Norwegian man, in a movement that seems to be directed against the categorization process itself, rather than against the antagonist.

4.1.2 Susana B

This narrative by Susana was told as a response to a question by the interviewer. The first one to answer, after some negotiation with the moderator, was Juana who introduced Juana B: an I/S encounters narrative analyzed in 4.2.4. After a 15 seconds long pause, the moderator remained silent and eventually gave the turn to Susana by looking at her, waiting for an answer to the question "what was your best and worst experience in Norway" (lines 1-13 in Juana B, cf. 4.2.4). Susana B is a double narrative like the

narrative told immediately before, Juana B. It could be argued that Susana B is a type of second story (Sacks 1992) if we consider that Susana repeated Juana's double narrative structure when she was prompted to answer by the moderator, though narratives are not thematically related according to the setting classification we introduced above. Leaving this discussion aside, Susana's narrative presents two stories that are embedded into one another and the second story builds greatly on the first one. These narratives were transcribed consecutively, and thus the numbering of Susana B picks up the numbers in the last clause of Juana B.

Susana tells first her worst experience, a job interview situation for a teaching position at a preschool, where her low proficiency in Norwegian cost her the job.

70	S	(01.06.05) no sé lo mejor de repente fue que: (2.1)	70	S	(01.06.05) I don't know the best (experience) was maybe that (2.14)
71		aparte de conocer a mi novio. @ (1.1)	71		besides meeting my boyfriend. @ (1.1)
72		e fue conseguir trabajo, (0.7) e: (1.1)	72		e it was finding a job, (0.7) e: (1.16)
73		porque bueno la primera ya	73		because when the first one well
74		eso creo de repente fue la <u>peor</u> experiencia que tuve	74		I think that was probably the <u>worst</u> experience I had
75		fue que fui a una entrevista de trabajo,	75		it was that I was at a job interview,
76		y había tenido nada más que cinco meses estudiando noruego, (.) (clears her voice) y:e: (1.6)	76		and I had been studying Norwegian for only five months, (.) (clears her voice) and e: (1.6)
77		fue una entr-entrevista con la directora y otra profesora de de un jardín de niños	77		it was an interview with the principal and another teacher at a preschool
78		entonces estaba la directora y otras dos tres profesoras más	78		then there was the principal and two three other teachers
79		>no me acuerdo<	79		>I don't remember<
80		entonces me sentí así como que: (.) <u>en la mira</u> de muchos (1.1)	80		then I felt like: (.) <u>on the spot</u> in front of many people (1.1)
81		empezó ahí a preguntarme -	81		there she started asking me -
82		a hacerme muchas preguntas,	82		asking a lot of questions,
83		y me empezó a preguntar (.) “del sistema educativo peruano	83		and started asking about (.) “the Peruvian educational system
84		cómo era,	84		how it was,
85		y en relación al noruego,”	85		and in relation to the Norwegian,”
86		osea yo tenía <u>cinco meses</u> estudiando noruego (.)	86		I mean I had been studying Norwegian for <u>five months</u> (.)
87		me había aprendido las <u>supuestas</u> preguntas, (V: mh @)	87		I had learned all the <u>typical</u> questions, (V: mh@)
88		y me sale preguntando sobre “el sistema educativo peruano,	88		and there she starts asking about “the Peruvian educational system,
89		y que lo traduzca,	89		and that I should translate it,
90		y no sé qué.” (0.7)	90		and that.” (.)

This was her first job interview, and she had been studying Norwegian for only five months prior to that moment, as stated in the orientation of the narrative in the excerpt above. In the orientation section (lines 76-80) Susana introduces the antagonist

characters, the preschool principal and two or three teachers, who are not identified with any categories. The narrative actions start immediately after, with a constructed dialogue passage in the voice of the representative of the preschool that acted as the interviewer, who asked about the “Peruvian educational system” (lines 83-85). The voice of the interviewer is not directly quoted, but marked by a contrasting voice quality and rising intonation (Günthner 1999). Also, the use of the phrase “the Peruvian educational system” seems to refer in its formulation to a previous instance of use, to someone else’s voice that is repeated in a new context (Tannen 2007).

In line 86 Susana repeats almost the same line as in the orientation (line 76), about she having been studying Norwegian for a short period of time when the interview took place. With this repetition Susana stresses the contrast between her situation in Norway, of looking for a job with little knowledge of Norwegian, and the task the interviewer was asking her to do, to describe the Peruvian educational system and to translate it to Norwegian. This was an extremely demanding task, above Susana’s linguistic abilities in Norwegian at the time. Susana also introduces new background information about how she had prepared herself for the interview in this evaluative passage: she had learned to answer the typical questions expected at job interview setting (line 87), but was not ready to answer questions about the Peruvian educational system and to translate the structure of Peruvian educational institutions to Norwegian (line 88). Susana evaluates the topics asked by the interviewer as not typical of a job interview, as Victor did in the job interview narrative Victor B. The narrative action continues with Susana’s answer to these questions:

91	S	y este: (.)	91	S	and e: (.)
92		y lo de dije que: (.)	92		and I said tha:t (.)
93		<u>ah</u> ella misma me dijo creo,	93		<u>oh</u> she herself told me I think,
94		“puedes hablar inglés si es que tu quieres.”	94		“you can speak in English if you want.”
95		y yo le dije “ok” entonces lo expliqué en inglés,	95		and I said “OK” then I explained it in English,
96		y de ahí agarró y me dijo:	96		and there she said to me
97		“la verdad que tu nivel de noruego está muy:- (.) bajo,	97		“well your Norwegian level is rea:lly- (.) low,
98		y muy mal que hablaste inglés.”	98		and it was really bad that you spoke in English.”
99		y yo “pero es que tú me dijiste que hable inglés”-	99		and I “but you told me to speak in English”-

So as Susana is about to quote her answer (line 92), she remembers that the director of the kindergarten offered her the possibility of answering in English (lines 93-94). Susana accepts the offer and provides an answer about the Peruvian educational system in English. After this, the director presents her judgment of Susana's performance in the interview: her proficiency in Norwegian is quite bad. Susana is appalled at the evaluation of the character of the director, and responds by introducing her voice, with a contrasting high tone, complaining that it was the director who had given her permission to answer in English (line 99). Susana's response is more of an internal reaction that fulfill an evaluative function in the narrative, an evaluation embedded in the narrative in the form of a dialogue, but actually performed from the narrating universe, that is, outside of the story world and in the interaction. The internal evaluation of the narrative in the voice of Susana introduces an open evaluative section immediately after:

100	S	entonces (1.4) yo sabía también de que tenía muy poco tiempo e: hablando noruego. (.)	100	S	then (1.4) I knew that I had been speaking Norwegian for a short time. (.)
101		* pero dije "bueno igual me lanzo" verdad,	101		*but I said "well I'll just give it a go" right,
102	V	claro	102	V	sure
103	S	pero: me trato <u>tan mal</u> ,	103	S	bu:t she treated me <u>so badly</u> ,
104		y me hizo sentir <u>tan horrible</u> ,	104		and she made me feel <u>so awful</u> ,
105		(V: exhales) que <u>salí: llora:ndo ese día</u>	105		(V:exhales) that <u>I left cry:ing that day</u>
106		y había una tormenta <u>de nie:ve</u>	106		and there was a <u>sno:w</u> storm
107		y yo dije (V: @) "qué <u>mierda</u> hago yo en este país" @ @ @	107		and I said (V:@) "what the <u>fuck</u> am I doing in this country" @ @ @
108		y de regreso la nieve caía en la cara (mimes with hands on her face)	108		and on the way back home the snow falling on my face (mimes with hands on her face)
109		y yo así "ahh" lloraba @ @	109		and I was like " ah" crying @ @

Susana repairs her position in the narrative, arguing that she knew that she spoke little Norwegian at the time of the interview, but she still wanted to try out for a relevant job where her education and work experience were relevant. Her attitude of "well, I'll just give it a go" is supported by the other participants, as in Victor's affirming response: "sure". The moral stance they support would be: There is nothing wrong about applying for a job you are qualified to do, even if you speak little Norwegian.

Susana argues that she was treated badly (lines 103-104); she was humiliated by being "tricked" into speaking English and then punished for doing so. The interviewer clearly evaluates English as an unsatisfactory language of communication at work, something that might also index contrasts in the symbolic value of English in South America and

Norway. Fluency in English is not acquired in the public school system in South America, thus families that have the opportunity often pay for private tutoring or bilingual schooling. Consequently, knowledge and command of English can sometimes work as an indicator of class in these societies. Whereas in Norway all students graduating from public schools (which are the vast majority) have a good command of English, so this criterion does not function as a good indicator of class in Norway. Moreover, the level of English knowledge that is considered as a good command of the language is much higher, something that indicates contrast in the *orders of indexicality* (Blommaert 2005), meaning that the same linguistic resources can be indexical of different positions in different hierarchical symbolic structures. Such mismatch becomes evident in the case of mobility by migration, among other. Moreover, in the context of migration in Norway, speaking in English in formal situations is often interpreted as indexical of not speaking good enough Norwegian, as this narrative illustrates.

Susana introduces a situation of a job interview where she was evaluated for a position on the grounds of her proficiency in Norwegian and not her professional qualifications. Towards the end of the interview, when participants were providing some background information on themselves, Susana explained that she not only had a degree as a kindergarten teacher, but also a master's degree and an extra diploma. In Norway, the preschool teacher education consists of a three-year program, measured as 180 ECTS⁷ points. Susana was recognized as having a 300 points education but still encounters trouble in getting recognition for it. Susana is clearly qualified for a teaching position, with almost twice the necessary points required for teachers with Norwegian education. The fact that she cannot communicate her qualifications in Norwegian, that she cannot "translate" them to Norwegian, causes her to lose recognition for her education in the story world.

The problem presented in this narrative, the difficulty Norwegian employers have in evaluating the qualification of candidates with foreign education, corresponds with the findings of FAFO's report on experiences of employers and syndical representatives with minorities in the workplace (Tronstad 2010). According to this report, the difficulty of assessing the professional and academic background of candidates, along with the level of language proficiency of candidates or workers were among the biggest challenges

⁷ ECTS: European Credit Transfer System, is an European standard for comparing study attainment and performance.

employers had to face. Susana indexes this problem through the voice of the interviewer who asks for a translation of the Peruvian educational system. Norwegian proficiency is also formulated as an essential factor for proving qualification and negotiating a professional identity, as English is not an acceptable alternative.

There are no categories used in this narrative, but this does not mean that there is no categorization work going on. The characters of the interviewer and Susana are introduced in the roles of the interviewer and job applicant in the setting of the job interview, and the factor that distinguishes them beyond their roles, is proficiency in Norwegian. The character of the interviewer is implicitly categorized as a Norwegian on the basis that this character is portrayed through the use of a category bound activity (cf. 2.2.1) for the category *Norwegian*: namely speaking Norwegian. The character of Susana has low proficiency in the language, and therefore is clearly not a Norwegian in the universe of the narrative. The categorization of characters is done on the axis of language proficiency, where the interviewer is a member of the category Norwegian since that character not only speaks, asks questions in Norwegian, but she is also in the position of emitting adequacy judgments on the Norwegian performance of non-members of the category, that is, Susana. What is problematic in the story world is that Norwegian proficiency is equated to professional qualification, and Susana's attempts to negotiate a professional identity for herself are dismissed for being coded in the wrong language: English.

The narrative concludes with Susana leaving the interview crying. Victor exhales loudly, indicating solidarity towards Susana's position. The narrative ends with a theatrical and humoristic description of how Susana got home that day (lines 105-109) as she introduced detailed information about the scene she described and her state of mind: she walked home crying in the middle of a snow storm. The other participants laugh and show solidarity towards Susana. This theatrical description of the situation in the story world and of Susana's feelings, connects the story world to the present of the interaction by making the story relevant to the question asked by the moderator: this was one of Susana's worst experiences in Norway.

Immediately after the first story concludes, Susana introduces the second one, of another job interview where she prepared really well after having had such a bad experience the first time.

114	S	y la siguiente entrevista que tuve, (0.7)	114	S	and the next interview that I had, (0.7)
115		me preparé mucho más,	115		I prepared myself much better,
116		traduje todo el: el sistema peruano en noruego, @	116		I translated the whole Peruvian education system to Norwegian, @
117		hice un power point,	117		I made a power point (presentation),
118		osea no sabes cómo me preparé (M: @)	118		I mean you have no idea how well I prepared myself (M:@)
119		nunca me había prepar- <u>ni en Perú</u> tanto (.)	119		I had never prepar- <u>not even in Peru</u> so much (.)
120		y dije “no esta vez sí” y:	120		and I said “no, this time yes” a:nd
121		bueno (.) osea caí e en un sitio donde necesitaban a alguien, <u>realmente</u> osea.	121		well (.) I mean I landed at a place where they <u>really</u> needed someone, I mean.
122		no fue <u>tan</u> difícil la entrevista como la otra	122		it wasn't <u>so</u> difficult the interview as the other one
123	V	ya	123	V	yeah
124	S	la otra creo que el nivel era más alto en realidad también osea	124	S	the other (interview) I think that there was a higher lever actually I mean
125		el nivel <u>profesional</u> era alto,	125		there was a high <u>professional</u> level,
126		en el otro lado exigían más que en el- (.) donde yo entré. (inhalas)	126		at the other place they demanded more than where I got in. (inhalas)

The narrative starts with a long orientation section that starts at a different temporal point in the narrative sequence than the first story: Susana introduces the process previous to the job interview. She prepared a power-point presentation of the Peruvian educational system, translated everything to Norwegian, and prepared herself like never before (lines 115-119). She repeats twice that she had prepared herself really well, stressing her determination and agentivity, and evaluates both job interview stories (lines 121-126). Susana compares both experiences and evaluates the second job interview as not as difficult as the first one, as “they really needed to hire someone” Susana argues, while the first one had a “higher professional level”.

Susana turns the focus to the second job interview story and argues that the turning point of the interview, and the reason why she got the job is that she offered to show the power point presentation she had prepared for the interview, without being asked to do so (lines 127, 139-140)

127	S	no y creo que el power point me <u>salvó</u> al final.	127	S	no and I think that the power point <u>saved</u> me at the end.
128		porque: este yo le enseñé -	128		beca:use e I showed it -
129		obviamente no me pidieron.	129		they obviously didn't ask me to do it.
130		pero dije “ah bueno he. he hecho esto	130		but I said “oh well and I ha:ve have made this
131		y les quiero enseñar para que vean como se trabaja en Perú.” y ya (.)	131		I want to show you so that you can see how we work in Peru.” and there (.)
132		y me dijeron “qué- ”	132		and they told me “what-”
133		osea eran cuatro señoras de cincuenta o sesenta años en la entrevista, <u>tres tres</u>	133		I mean they were four ladies between fifty or sixty years old at the interview, <u>three three</u>

134	y este me dijeron “qué puedes hacer esas cosas en la computadora,” (V: @)	134	and em: they said “can you make those things with the computer,” (V:@)
135	y yo “sí”	135	and I “yes”
136	“ <u>no</u> : porque nosotras tenemos computadora	136	“ <u>no</u> : because we have a computer (here)
137	y no podemos hacer nada (claps)” (V:@)	137	and we can't do any of those things (claps)” (V:@)
138	entonces este:	138	then em:
139	tú nunca sabes qué te va a salvar en una entrevista.	139	you never know what will save you at an interview.
140	asique yo creo que eso me salvó @ @ @	140	so I think that that saved me @ @ @
141	y de ahí me llamaron,	141	and there they called me,
142	y de ahí me dijeron este:	142	and they said em:
143	la directora me dijo que “bueno que	143	the principal told me that “well that
144	que le prometa que iba a seguir estudiando noruego” <u>obviamente</u> (.)	144	that I promised her that I would continue with Norwegian courses” <u>obviously</u> (.)
145	y yo “te lo prometo” @@	145	and I “I promise you” @@
146	y este ya (.) osea	146	and em: yeah (.) I mean
147	pero creo que eso fue lo que me salvó en realidad	147	but I think that that was what saved me actually
148	y ahí estaba súper feliz pues no xxx mhm @@	148	and there I was very happy well xxx mhm @@

In this story, Susana manages to steer the interview in spite of being in the role of the job applicant, in a clear contrast to the first story in the narrative. She takes the lead in the interview and offers to show a power-point presentation that could provide her future employers with the background information needed to evaluate her education. The action of showing the presentation functions as the turning point of the narrative, because by introducing this action Susana gives proof of her knowledge and thus constructs a professional identity for herself. The character of Susana performs this action in the constructed dialogue, where she introduces her own voice steering the interview, and thus positions herself in the story world as a professional teacher (lines 130-131). The response from the characters of the mature women who were interviewing her was that of surprise over her command of common office software. Susana categorizes the characters of the interview along the axis of age in which the interviewers were older woman who, as stereotypically expected, were not familiar with technology (line 139-140). Note the background repair in line 133, when Susana is about to introduce the interviewers' reaction to the power-point, Susana needs to provide extra background information on the age of the characters so that their reaction in the story world would be understandable to the audience. The stereotype “adult women usually have problems working with computers” underlies the repair and connects with lines 134 and 136-7, where the interviewers' lack of familiarity with computers is formulated in a short passage of constructed dialogue in their voices, where a power-point presentation is referred to as

“those things”. The voices of the interviewers are marked with a change in rhythm and rising tone, and show amazement over Susana’s command of technology, in a sort of naïve portrait of mature women, to which the other participants respond with laughter. Through the use of the categories *old* and *young* marked through a background repair that specified the age of the interviewers as well as through the reference to category bound activities: “the young master technology while the old do not”, Susana manages to negotiate a professional image. She positions herself as a young woman with computer skills and her command of Norwegian is not an issue that is problematized in the interview. She repeats (lines 139-140) the evaluation that the power-point, or showing command of computer software “saved her.” The resolution of this narrative is that Susana got a call telling her that she had gotten the job under one condition: She must promise that she would keep on attending Norwegian courses (lines 143-144). Her knowledge of Norwegian, though still an issue in this story, does not function as a negative factor that keeps her from getting the job, since she manages to give proof of her qualifications.

There is a clear contrast between the two narratives: in the first one the main categorization axis is that of proficiency in Norwegian, while in the second one age is more relevant. Though Susana is ascribed a rather agentive role in both narratives, in the second one her character actually manages to steer the topic of conversation and succeeds in presenting herself as a professional. There is no salient use of pronouns beyond the interpellation to the audience (line 49). Nevertheless, Susana receives quite a lot of feedback from the participants in the form of comments and laughter, which indicates that they show not only solidarity towards her, but also support her evaluations. Also, the formulation of the two job interview stories in an interactionally appropriate answer to the question of the interviewer shows how all the participants, including the moderator, contribute to co-constructing the narratives.

4.1.3 Victor C

This narrative was told after Susana B analyzed above (cf. 4.1.2), after a long 15 seconds pause, and also as an answer to the question “what was your best and worst experience in Norway?” Victor was not particularly excited about answering the question of the moderator, as the negotiations with the moderator regarding an answer show (lines 149-

169 in Victor C in the Appendix A). This narrative is also a double narrative that introduces two stories of job interviews. These stories are not particularly salient from the other job interview narratives previously analyzed. The universes introduced are more or less the same, though the complicating events are less dramatic since they introduce one story where lack of knowledge in Norwegian in an all-Norwegian environment led to public embarrassment, and a story of a ridiculous job interview. The categorizations introduced are roughly the same as analyzed before: the characters are Norwegians, who speak Norwegian as a first language, and Victor as a foreigner, or one who does not speak Norwegian very well. I will therefore not analyze this narrative completely here, but merely focus on some interesting aspects of the second story, about a job interview for a job in the airport express train (*flytoget*) in Oslo. This story introduces a different type of experience than the other job interview narratives, as this interview was for a job that was not related to Victor's education or previous work experience.

256	V	y hubo otras también así <u>malas</u> eh	256	V	and there were other <u>bad</u> ones like that eh
257		hubo otra em con fly-en el <i>flytoget</i>	257		there was another one em- at the <i>flytoget</i>
258		también e fue así como:	258		(airport train) too e it was li:ke
259		sí era un poco así como un <u>reality show</u>	259		it was a bit like <u>reality tv show</u> almost
260		casi			
261		como que nos hacían presen- (.)	261		like they made us presen- (.) stand in
262		ponernos adelante en un <u>escena:rio</u> ,	262		front on a <u>sta:ge</u> ,
263		y teníamos que presentarnos en <u>inglé:s</u>	263		and we had to present ourselves in
264			264		<u>E:nglish</u>
265		y habían ya no eran tres sino que eran	265		and there were not just three but <u>fi:ve</u>
266		<u>cinco</u> : personas de <i>flytoget</i> que estaban	266		people representing <i>flytoget</i> that were
267		como controlando como tú te	267		checking how you presented yourself
268		presentabas qué:	268		wha:t
269		si eras como <u>diverti:do</u> (chasquea los	269		if you were <u>fu:n</u> (claps with the fingers)
270		dedos)			
271		si eras como <u>se:rio</u> (.)	271		if you were <u>se:rious</u> (.)
272	S	° tanta cosa para [el <i>flytoget</i> , @]	272	S	° such a fuss for [<i>flytoget</i> @]
273	V	[y éramos como	273	V	[and we were like
274		veinte]	274		twenty]
275		éramos como veintitantos eh,	275		we were like twenty something ah,
276		éramos como veintitantas las personas	276		we were like twenty something people
277		que estaban solicitando trabajo. (1.5)	277		applying for that job. (1.5)

This story of a job interview contrasts with those analyzed before as it presents a group job-interview where interviewees were expected to introduce themselves in front of the other job applicants. The whole experience is compared to a “reality-tv show”, as the interviewees competed against each other on a stage to get the job. The situation is embarrassing, as the interviewers evaluated the applicants in front of each other, and on the basis of the quality of their performance (lines 262-263). Susana reacts surprised, by

asking in line 164 “such a fuss for (working) at the *flytoget*?” thus implicitly evaluating the job as not a good one, and the humiliation of having to perform on a stage as part of a job interview process was not worth this low-prestige position. As a closing evaluation, Victor contrasts this particular experience to other similar:

272	V	han sido como situaciones en las que uno se pone- (.)	272	V	those have been situations where you get - (.)
273		yo creo que eso es <u>difícil para cualquiera</u> (M: mhm)	273		I think that that is <u>difficult for anyone</u> (M: mhm)
274		pero cuando uno más encima no no domina bien el idio:ma, (1.5) entonces	274		but when you on top of that don't know the language, (1.5) very well then
275		es p- no sé si es casi peor o no pero:	275		es p- I don't know if it is even worse or not
276		yo en Chile no m- no: simplemente no lo habría hecho quizás. me entiendes,	276		me in Chile no m- no: I would have probably not done it. you know,
277		“ <u>ah</u> . esto que es esta huevada,” osea	277		“ <u>ah</u> what is this shit,” I mean
278		y me voy- me doy la medial vuelta y me voy (1.1)	278		I leave- I turn around and leave (1.1)
279		“no estoy <u>dispuesto</u> a esto” me entiendes, (M: mhm)	279		“I am not <u>willing</u> to do this” you know, (I: mhm)
280		pero acá uno esta dispuesto a <u>tantas cosas</u> (S: mhm) (2.14)	280		but here one is willing to do <u>so many things</u> (S: mhm) (2.14)

The story concludes after a short evaluative passage in which Victor generalizes the experience as part of the more general migrant experience (lines 272-275). Again, language proficiency is a key element in the formulation of a stressful situation (line 274). Then Victor introduces an interesting evaluation through an hypothetical narrative (Carranza 1998) in which Victor presents a counterfactual scenario of facing the same type of situation in Chile. He quotes himself in an hypothetical dialogue where he stands on his principles and declares he is not willing to put himself in such an embarrassing position (lines 277 and 279), to conclude with a coda that states a moral position (line 280) “but here one is willing to do so many things”. In this passage Victor takes a moral stance that contrasts with the one presented in Victor B, where he argued for self respect in being treated badly at a job interview. Here, Victor stated that he was willing to do what he has to do to get a job, which is to earn money and provide for his family. In the process of insertion into the labor market in the new country, Victor had to accept conditions and situations he would have never accepted in his home country. In stating the coda, Victor switches from the first person, to a generalized *uno* “one” to generalize his position, and also reconnect with the narrating universe by orienting to the other participants through the switch in pronouns.

4.1.4 Discussion and conclusion for the analyses of job interview narratives

The narratives analyzed in this section have in common a work-related type of setting. It was surprising to see several job interview narratives in the corpus (three narratives that introduce five job interview stories) as there were no questions designed to elicit this type of stories. Nevertheless, the occurrence of these narratives in the interview seems “natural”, as job interviews are “stressful” (Akinasso and Ajitutu 1982) or “dramatic” (Adelswärd 1988) interactional encounters where participants engage in intense negotiations of individual identities. Given the *sense-making* function of narrative in social life, as a tool that can “imbue life events with a temporal and logical order, to demystify them and establish coherence across past, present, and as yet unrealized experience” (Ochs and Capps 2001: 2), it is not surprising that participants chose to introduce job interview narratives in the process of reflecting over their position and experiences in Norway. Moreover, two of the job interview narratives (Susana A, cf. 4.2.3, and Victor C, cf. 4.1.3) were told in response to the question about “the best and worst experience in Norway”, and also indicates the relevance of job interview situations in the formulation of migrant experience. The saliency of job interview stories in the interview might indicate that the process of job application is an important part of the participant’s experience in the first years as migrants to Oslo. The participants had been living in Norway for between three and five years at the moment of the interview, and most of the narratives are temporally placed during the adaptation process to Norway, where job interviewing is an important activity.

Moreover, the type of formalized interaction stipulated in job interviews is especially relevant to the experience of migrants to Western industrialized societies, since it is through the process of job interviewing that access to economic rewards is given, together with participation in the majority’s society. There is an unbalanced power relation natural to the job interview setting, where the interviewer evaluates the interviewee’s performance in the light of her or his expectations and with two possible outcomes: the applicant is either evaluated as “worthy” of the position or not. Thus, the possession of symbolic and communicative resources, such as language proficiency and knowledge of culturally determined conversational strategies, are essential for the interviewee’s capacity to negotiate a professional identity.

The job interview has become a major gate-keeping situation where social inequality is ritually dramatized, where basic differences in class, ethnicity, access to power and knowledge and cultural specific discourse conventions mediate the interaction between participants. (Akinassio and Ajiroto 1982: 120)

More recently, Campbell and Roberts (2007) detected a contrast in the performance of British and born-abroad job applicants in a study of job interviews, which they interpreted as related to the participants access to “job interview English”. These researchers point out that command of job interview English allows applicants to create a “convincing persona” that synthesizes the individual’s personal experience with the values of the company, and can thus be evaluated as desirable potential employees by the hiring organization. In this sense, language proficiency rather than ethnic differences is the determining factor for success in job interviews, as no differences in the success rates were detected for *white* and *minority ethnic* British candidates. *Born abroad* candidates on the other hand, had a success rate 21 percent lower than the British. Campbell and Roberts show that the linguistic skills demanded at the job interviews analyzed were not related to the demands of the job, but rather to the production of the institutional discourse that creates the organization.

In line with these findings, Susana B presents a narrated universe where high proficiency in Norwegian is equated with professionalism; thus the organization that is presented with the highest level of professionalism is the one in which high command of Norwegian is considered as part of the job description (the first story), while the organization with the lower professional level is the one that evaluates the qualifications of the candidate beyond the language proficiency and is willing to lower the language demand in order to hire a qualified candidate (the second story).

We have seen how participants use national and ethnic category labels such as *Noruego*, *extranjero*, and *Latino* as inferentially rich categorization devices (Sacks 1992) with related social stereotypes. Participants used categories to present the characters in their narratives, using the categories in relevance to the story world as well as to the interactional context (De Fina 2000, 2003), as is the case of Victor B where Victor’s ethnic background was the issue that caused him not to obtain the job, told à propos a previous discussion regarding stereotypes and categorization. In Susana B, there is no overt use of categories, as we saw above, but the implicit categorization of the characters through the axis of language proficiency is the essential conflict in the first story, while age and language proficiency for the second one. In Victor C, the categorizations of

character are in line with what was analyzed in Susana B: Norwegians speak Norwegian, while foreigners struggle.

4.2 The institutional and service encounters narratives

The group of institutional and service encounters narratives consists of the narratives that presented story worlds in settings of interactions with officials, health professionals or customer services at public offices or places. What these settings have in common is that they introduce fairly typified roles for the participants in the interactions: that of client/clerk, patient/nurse, client/office deputy, etc., in which the character in the role of the service provider represents of an office, institution or company.

4.2.1 Juana A

This is a narrative of a *service encounter* of one of Juana's first experiences in Norway. The story is about her being treated badly by the clerk of a kiosk that was near the Norwegian school she was attending, and was elicited by the question "what is the strongest experience that you remember from the first time in Norway?" at the beginning of the interview. Juana was the first one to answer, after a short pause.

01	M	(00.08.22) y qué: cuál- cuál fue la experiencia más fuerte que recordás de de ése primer tiempo,	01	M	(00.08.22) and what- what- what was the strongest experience that you remember from that time,
02		así de: una cosa en- en concreto	02		like: one concrete experience
03	J	yo creo el la primera vez que- que:	03	J	I think the first time that- that
04		para <u>mí</u> fue el: sentir el <u>racismo</u> por primera vez, e:	04		for me it was the first time I experienced racism for the first time, e:
05		osea me-nunca lo había sentido en México no, [donde eres] uno más que nad-	05		I mean m-I had never felt that in Mexico, right,[where you're] one like the rest that noth-
06	M	[qué qué:] =	06	M	[what what]=
07		=[qué pasó, te acordás] de alguna situación,=	07		=[what happened, do you remember] some situation,=
08	J	[No, simplemente: e:]	08	J	[no, just e:]
09		=Sí p- ir a un <i>Narvesen</i> @	09		=yes w- to go to a Narvesen @
10		a una tienda y que alguien te trate mal porque:	10		to a shop and that someone treat you badly becau:se
11		>porque eres extranjero<	11		>because you are a foreigner<
12		>porque no puedes hablar< (1)	12		>because you can't speak< (1)

Juana introduces the narrative with an abstract that presents the story as an experience of racism. The moderator asked what had happened and got a short narrative, or an abstract (lines 09-12) for the whole narrative, formulated in the infinitive and present tenses (infinitive line 09, present lines 10-12). This choice in tempus does not correspond with the canonical narrative structure stipulated in temporally ordered narrative linked through temporal juncture (cf. 2.3.1) mainly since infinitive lacks tempus that can structure the temporal development of the story. The infinitive is the nominal form of the verb that creates a reified conceptualization of an event (Langacker 2008: 108-12).

Juana frames the narrative as a story of racism in the abstract, and introduces a short version of the narrative where the category label *extranjero* is proposed as the reason for the sequence of events to be presented in the narrative: go to a shop, and be treated badly (lines 10-12). This categorization (line 11) is immediately reformulated with a characteristic category bound activity for *extranjero*: to not speak Norwegian (line 12). At an interactional level, Juana chooses to use an inclusive pronoun *tú* “you”, thus aligning herself with the other participants and in the same movement, generalizing the implication of the sequence of actions to include other foreigners than just herself. This use of pronouns, along with the choice of use of present, is what Carranza (1998: 302-6) analyzes as “narratives of habitual actions,” which have the argumentative effect of making the arguments or perspectives of the narrative harder to challenge, as these narratives generalize the experiences they present as to count for more occasions (through the use of tempus) and individuals (through the inclusive use of pronouns).

After a new request from the moderator for a version of the experience (line 15), Juana introduces the complicating actions of the narrative:

13	J	e: eso fue a lo que: °bueno- (1.1)	13	J	it was that- °well- (1.1)
14		fue un- una persona que- (0.8) que sí se	14		it was a- a person that- (0.8) that behaved
		porto bastante m:al no, [xxx]			quite ba:dly right, [xxx]
15	M	pero [qué-] qué te dijo o	15	M	but [what-] what did he say
		qué cómo fue,			or how was it,
16	J	e- pues simplemente intentas hablar en	16	J	well you just try to speak in Norwegian.
		noruego.			
17		te <u>corri:gen</u> , no	17		they <u>corre:ct</u> you, right,
18		se <u>rí:en</u> , e- bueno.	18		they <u>lau:gh</u> , e- well.
19		era una persona que trabajaba en un	19		he/she was a person who worked at a
		<i>Narvesen</i> que estaba junto al			<i>Narvesen</i> (kiosk) that was besides the
		<i>voksenopplæringssenter</i>			<i>voksenopplæringssenter</i>
20		y estaba: o sea	20		and she/he wa:s I mean
21		a pesar de que constantemente llegaban	21		in spite of foreigners constantly arriving (to
		extranjeros			the shop)

22	pus no era una persona que era muy <u>feliz</u> @ en su trabajo,	22	well he/she wasn't a person who was very happy @ with her/his job,
23	y: se aprovechaba un poco de: la situación (0.8) de:	23	a:nd he/she would take advantage o:f the situation (0.8) o:f
24	V y se desquitaba con los extranjeros @	24	V and he would take it out on the foreigners @
25	J y se- y se desquitaba con nosotros	25	J and- and she/he would take out on us

The narrative actions are formulated in the present tense (lines 16-18). Nevertheless, the sequence of actions depicted has a narrative quality to it, since it presents at least one narrative juncture in Labov's terms (cf. 2.3.1) *first* you try to speak, *then* they correct and laugh. Beyond the structural descriptions of prototypical narratives, the use of the present tense in narrative has been documented as a rhetorical resource for constructing the peak of the narrative tension in the complicating action, or Historical Present (Schiffrin 1981; Silva-Corvalan 1983). This doesn't seem to be the case for Juana A, because one of the key elements in using present as Historical Present is in the alternation between the past and present tenses. In lines 16-18, all clauses are produced in the present tense, so there is no contrast in the use of tempus. What is achieved by constructing the narrative in the present tense is a generalized description of the experience as if that event happened many times, and still does in the present: a Generalized Present. In this sense, the present tense functions in this narrative as a discourse strategy, an argumentative resource for sustaining the point of the narrative: experiences of discrimination or racism are common to foreigners in Norway. Van Dijk (1984: 89) argues that in the analysis of narratives of racism, the use of the present is a rhetorical strategy for creating a generalized story about how things generally function in the present. Juana's framing of the narrative as a case of racism is constructed as a generalized experience of being an immigrant in Norway. This idea is stressed in the use of the same inclusive second person as in the abstract of the story (lines 11-12). This pronoun seems to refer both to the other participants in the interactional situation, including them in the common experience, and also to other foreigners in Norway.

In clauses 17-18, Juana uses the second person in the object position, also generalizing her experience of being corrected, laughed at by "others". The empty referent behind the impersonal form in the third person plural stresses the antagonism between you (and me, in the inclusive meaning of the second person) *foreigners*; and they, *Norwegians*, the "others". The character of the clerk is implicitly identified as a Norwegian since he is

someone with good command of the Norwegian language who can point out deviant performances, which we already analyzed as a category bound activity for the category *Norwegian* in Victor A and Susana B.

In her analysis of the narratives of Latin American immigrants in the United States, Carranza (1998: 305) found similar argumentative strategies as those used by Juana in this passage:

Clearly, the occurrence of the indefinite pronouns “uno” or “tú” ‘you’ and of the Present Tense performs an argumentative function. In these cases it is not only the frequency but also the generalization of the experience that provide a well-founded basis for the position the storyteller puts forth.

This narrative thematizes discrimination in a manner that is not only generalizable to a group, the *extranjeros*, but also to the present time: those situations still occur nowadays. Knowledge of, and good performance in, Norwegian is what differentiates characters in this story world as foreigner and non-foreigner, implicitly Norwegians. In lines 19-25, Juana introduces a background repair (Carranza 1998) where she provides more information required for interpreting the narrative, which functions as an evaluation of the sequence of events just presented: She provides extra information on the location and antagonist character in the narrative in a manner that explains the sequence of actions. The kiosk where this situation occurred was located near an adult educational centre where Norwegian as a second language courses are held (*voksenopplæringscenter*), and besides the fact that there were a lot of foreigners buying at the kiosk, the clerk would still be unpleasant to them. It is assumed that by having extended contact with foreigners, the clerk should have been more understanding, or at least used to the situation of speaking with learners of Norwegian. It is also assumed that the clerk was not happy with his job, since working at a Narvesen would be a low-wage, low-qualification, low-prestige job. Victor then steps in and collaboratively finishes Juana’s reasoning: he was not happy about his life, and would then take it out on the foreigners. In line 25, Juana assertively responds to Victor’s formulation by identifying herself as a foreigner: *nosotros* ‘us’.

Juana positions her character in the story world in opposition to the clerk, categorized as *extranjero* and *noruego* correspondingly. As we already saw, the ascription of these categories is mainly done on the axis of language proficiency in Norwegian, something that corresponds with what we also have seen in the analysis of previous narratives. There is a contrast between the different types of agency assigned to the antagonist sides.

Juana's character is mainly passive, she is going to the kiosk and trying to speak Norwegian and is treated badly. The character of the clerk, on the other hand, is portrayed as aggressive and humiliating foreigners. Juana switches between singular and plural first person for referring to herself (lines 23-4), thus collectivizing her experience and consequently generalizing it, as we saw in the analysis of Victor A. The reference to the clerk alternates with "they" which we interpret as standing for *Norwegians*, who are the agents treating foreigners badly, laughing, taking advantage, etc.

Nevertheless, Juana covertly challenges the prejudice against immigrants and their lack of command of Norwegian by strategically introducing two instances of code-switching: She not only uses the Norwegian intonation for introducing the name of the kiosk chain where the story is situated, 'Narvesen' (lines 09 and 19), but also the complex compound-noun *voksenopplæringscenter*, which means "adult educational centre". She signals her command of Norwegian, and also implicitly criticizes the position of the kiosk clerk, who laughed at her, by giving proof of her proficiency in Norwegian and also distancing herself from this Norwegian worker. Juana repositions herself as an educated person at the interactional level, in contrast with the character of the clerk, whom she categorizes as someone with a bad job (line 22). In this sense, Juana manages to reposition herself with a positive, powerful stance in the lines of education, and ultimately class, thus inverting the role of a foreigner with low proficiency in Norwegian with low agentivity.

After a short pause, Juana starts closing the narrative with open evaluative remarks about the story told:

26	J	no no fui la primera ni la última no, a la	26	J	I wasn't the first nor the last one right, to
		que le pasó esto pero:			whom that happened bu:t
27		pero fue la primera vez que me di	27		but it was the first time that I realized that-
		cuenta que- (0.8) que: (.)			(0.8) tha:t (.)
28		osea que sentí en: pus en carne propia	28		I mean that I felt it on: well on my own
		lo que es que la gente te trate <u>diferente</u>			skin what it is that people treat you
					differently
29		o que te trate mal por por como te ves o	29		or badly because of the way you look or
		por- como hablas (I:mhm) no,			how you talk (I:mhm) right,
30		que es algo que no no me había tocado	30		it is something that I hadn't experienced in:
		vivir en: (.) pues nunca antes en mi			(.) well never before in my life (2.14)
		vida (2.14)			
31		tal vez no es gran cosa ahorita pero en	31		maybe that's not a big deal now but in that
		ese momento: me- fue cuando caí- me			mo:ment m- it was when I realized right,
		cayó en cuenta no, que que:			that tha:t
32		que era alguien diferente en este país.	32		that I was someone different in this country
		no,			right,
33		de de haber- de ser alguien igual a	33		from being someone like everybody else in
		todos los demás en en el mío. no,			in my own (country) right,

Juana maintains the use of the generalized second person in alternation with the first person. Interestingly Juana introduces the dimension of ethnic features as a ground for categorization along with language (line 29). Looking different than everyone else, speaking a different language constitutes evidence for being categorized as a foreigner, and thus be treated badly in the narrated universe. This introduces a dimension of ethnic categorization that was not specially thematized by the participants in the interview, in contrast to most work on categorization and identity in narrative (van Dijk 1993; De Fina 2003, 2006; Relaño Pastor 2010), where ethnic categorization in the terms of race is pervasive to the narratives.

Juana A is a narrative about categorization, about being identified as a foreigner in negative terms, due to poor command of Norwegian. The theme of linguistic performance as an indicator of group identity repeats itself across narratives and participants, as we have already seen in Victor C and Susana B. The themes of language difficulties or problems seem to be quite common in narratives of migrants' experiences (Relaño Pastor and De Fina 2005; King and De Fina 2010), as we will discuss in the following subsection.

4.2.2 Victor A

This narrative can be analyzed into two stories, as it presents an *institutional encounter* narrative introduced by a *Norwegian courses* narrative. The *Norwegian courses* narrative can be defined as a *small story* (Georgakopoulou 2007) as it is a general story, told without a clear temporal progression or constant moral stance. This short narrative was elicited by a question about the participant's first day at Norwegian courses. Susana and Juana answered first and Victor was pressed into taking the turn by the moderator, who assigned it to him after a three and a half seconds long pause. He was hesitant about how to answer and started telling the story without a clear point, taking long pauses as he spoke. In the *Norwegian courses* small story (lines 01-16 in the Appendix A), Victor presented some information about his linguistic background that is relevant to the institutional narrative. I will not analyze nor quote this introductory passage here, but a full transcript with translation can be found in the Appendix A. Victor attended Norwegian courses for a short period of time after his arrival to Norway. He had spoken Norwegian as a child, but he could not remember the language as an adult, so he had to

learn Norwegian again, re-learn it (lines 06-07, in the Appendix A). He started at Norwegian courses, but he had to stop attending classes because he had to work.

17	V	luego de do: dos meses o tres yam (1)	17	V	after two: or three month I da- (1)
18		me: me tuve que poner a trabajar. (1.4)	18		I ha: had to start working. (1.4)
19		estaba obligado a trabaja:r,	19		I was obliged to wo:rk,
20		tenía que trabaja:r ,	20		I had to wo:rk,
21		me había casado con: Violeta, y (1)	21		I had gotten married to Violeta, a:nd (1)
22		necesitaba demostrar que tenía <i>inte:cto</i>	22		I needed to show that I had <i>i:ntekt</i> (income)
23		y que era un noruego:, (0.8) como todo el resto. @	23		and that I was a Norwegian:, (0.8) like everyone else. @
24		y eso fue difícil. (0.8) (mhm)	24		and that was hard. (0.8) (mhm)

Victor repeats or paraphrases the same line three times: “I had to start working, I was obliged to work, I had to work” (lines 18-20). Repetition fulfills several functions in conversation (Tannen 2007: 59-61): facilitating the production of language, helping comprehension, creating cohesion, facilitating interaction, and thus creating interpersonal involvement. In this passage, besides fulfilling all of these functions, repetition also marks the disruption that the need of working has for the story, and at the same time stresses the urgency of the situation Victor found himself in as a newcomer to Oslo: He had to get a job in order to not only provide for his small family, but also to fulfill the prerequisites for applying for a residence permit for his wife. Victor makes reference to the prerequisites by introducing the code-switch *intecto*. This is the Norwegian word *inntekt* “income” that is modified to fit Spanish phonology rendering *intecto*. This word is specifically stressed in the narrative through vowel elongation, thus overtly signaling the reference to the legal Discourse that determines the prerequisites for assigning residence permit on the basis of family reunification (UDI 2011b). The use of the Norwegian loan word also presupposes the multilingual background common to the participants and shared experiences with immigration authorities in Norway since all participants understood what Victor was referring to. As I will show, Victor makes multiple references in this narrative to the legal Discourse on immigration and state organisms in charge of implementing policies. He shows knowledge of the system and experience in dealing with it, and many times presupposes that knowledge in the other participants.

Victor needed to prove that he was “a Norwegian like every other” (line 23), identifying himself with the category *Norwegian* for the first time in the interview. He laughs immediately after, thus distancing himself from this self-identification through irony. He

then refers anaphorically to a previous question asked by the moderator by repetition (lines 25-26): a question he had not answered, about what the biggest contrast he saw between Norway and his home country was when he moved to Oslo (see the script of questions at the Appendix B). This implicit reference to the previous question triggers the narrative:

25	V	yo creo que ése fue el el- (1) como el:	25	V	I think that was the- (1) like the:
26		el choque más grande fue ése ser- e	26		the biggest shock was that of being- e
27		o sea tener papeles de norue:go	27		I mean having Norwegian papers
28		ser no- como como digo así como	28		to be No- like like I say like to be
		<u>técnicamente</u> ser noruego			<u>technically</u> Norwegian
29		pero en la realidad ser: (.) chileno. (.)	29		but actually be: (.) Chilean (.)
30		ser un extranjero.	30		to be a foreigner

The abstract of the story (lines 26-30) introduces three category labels, all ascribed to the character of Victor, in an interesting constellation: Victor is *technically Norwegian*, but is actually *Chilean*, that is, a *foreigner*. The category *Norwegian* is modified by the hedge *technically*, that narrows the definition of the category to a level of expertise. By hedging a category one defines clear limits for it in relation to concrete, expert parameters (Lakoff 1987: 123). Being Norwegian is then narrowly defined in legal terms as a person that has Norwegian citizenship: a Norwegian technically speaking. Victor is a *Norwegian* in the narrow, expert sense of the word: a Norwegian citizen with a Norwegian passport. This categorization is in contrast with the “true” self-identification of Victor as “*actually* a Chilean, a foreigner.” Victor indicates that there is another shared notion of the category Norwegian, one that exceeds the technical sense of the word and refers to a linguistic, cultural, and ethnic group. This is why he distances himself from the self-ascription of this category by laughing (in line 23) and hedging (line 28).

The *institutional encounter* narrative is about Victor’s first visit to the police office to request some certifications needed to apply for a residence permit for his wife. This narrative was repeatedly negotiated between Victor and the moderator, since Victor insisted on generalizing his experiences with institutions in Norway in one single and generalized story, and the moderator continued to ask about concrete events in the past. Victor marks his intention of generalizing his experience in the use of verbal aspect (Spanish Past Imperfect), intonation (vowel elongation), and the use of adverbs like *siempre* ‘always’.

31	V	siempre cuando iba a hacer papeles al- (0.7) a la policía,	31	V	always when I 'd go to fix my papers to- (0.7) to the police
32		cuando iba a cambiar mi	32		when I 'd go to change my:
33		cuando ya tratar de sacar el permiso de conducir, cuando (1.5)	33		then I'd try to get a driver's licence whe:n (1.5)
34		cuando iba a cualquier lado yo en realidad no era nunca era un noruego	34		wherever I went I was never actually I was not a Norwegian
35		a pesar de que yo mostraba mi pasapo:rte,	35		in spite of showing my pa:ssport,
36		a pesar de que...	36		in spite of...
37	M	pero te acuerdas no sé la primera vez que fuiste a la policía	37	M	but do you remember I don't know the first time you went to the police
38		[ponte que]...	38		[figure that]
39	V	[sí sí] sí decían	39	V	[yes yes] yes they would say
40		bueno	40		well

Victor introduces an account of general or habitual events that have the common denominator of being stories of not being recognized as a Norwegian citizen by a representative of a public organism, such as the police and the Department of Motor Vehicles (lines 31-4). He creates a generalized feeling for his first experiences in Norway by equating different experiences as juxtaposed components of the same experience. He stresses the impression of unity by the use of PI, as we already saw for Victor B (cf. 4.1.1). Lines 31-35 are all formulated in PI, that along with the adverbial modifiers (*siempre* “always”, *cualquier lado* “wherever”, *nunca* “never”) create the image of a generalized past, of a time where Victor was constantly not recognized as a Norwegian. He also uses a particular ascending intonation together with vowel elongation in the tonic syllable of the last word of these phrases (lines 31, 33 and 35) that creates list-like intonation that stresses the feeling of repetitive actions that happened many times in the past (Tannen 2007).

After the question from the moderator about one particular experience, the first time he went to the police office (line 37), Victor narrows his narrative down to that concrete experience.

41	V	yo iba con: -	41	V	I 'd go wi:th -
42		como no sabía: noruego,	42		since I didn't speak Norwegian,
43		entonces me acompañaba mi- mi papá y: (1.7)	43		then my- my dad would come with me a:nd (1.7)
44		entonces mi papá era el que el que de cierta manera: (1.2)	44		then my dad was the one who in one way or ano:ther (1.2)
45		el <u>hablaba</u> por mí me entiendes, cuando yo hacía los trámites (.) y:	45		he would <u>speak</u> for me you know, when I was presenting my papers (.) a:nd
46		y la policía le decía que “no	46		and the police would say that “no
47		que quería que yo le hablara,	47		that he/she wanted me to speak,

48	porque si yo era un noruego entonces	48	because if I was a Norwegian then that I
	que yo le hablara noruego. (0.6)		should speak in Norwegian to her. (0.6)
49	que por qué estaba hablando él por mí”	49	that why was he (my dad) speaking for
	(1.31)		me” (1.31)
50	entonces él le explicaba que “yo había	50	then he would explain to her that “I had
	estado afuera		been abroad
51	que no me acordaba el idioma”	51	that I didn't remember the language”
52	“entonces que no era noruego.” (2.95)	52	“then that I wasn't a Norwegian.” (she
			said) (2.95)

In the formulation of the first visit to the police station, a single experience in the past, Victor maintains the temporal structure of using PI. The use of PI is not always connected to the idea of a finite action in the past. A recent study (Gutierrez Böhmer and Mazzocchi forthcoming) has shown that, for a corpus of 52 narratives of Argentine Spanish speakers, PI was used with a perfective value, instead of the perfective variant simple past, in several passages that introduced experiences that undoubtedly were single occurrences in the past. In this case, however, it is more likely that these forms are instances of imperfect that introduce perfective actions, as an argumentative resource in line with Carranza (1998) and shown in the analysis of the previous excerpts, and Victor B (cf. 4.1.1).

In lines 46 to 52, the narrative actions take the form of a constructed dialogue between a police officer and Victor. Victor could not speak Norwegian at the time introduced by the narrative, so his father would accompany him and function as an interpreter, since he is a Chilean man who has resided in Norway for many years and is fluent in Norwegian. The constructed dialogue among these characters takes the form of indirect speech. The dialogue is constructed in an indirect, mediated manner, where all clauses are introduced by a relative pronoun that marks Victor's role in mediating discourse, thus placing the audience of the narrative in the same position as Victor. The use of constructed dialogue for introducing the narrative actions cleverly provides more dramatic tension to the narrative, since it provides a *mise en scène* where characters act by speaking, instead of merely reporting the actions.

The character of the ‘policewoman’ *la policía* in the narrative needs to be further analyzed in order to understand its referent, since *la policía* means in Spanish both ‘female police officer’ and ‘the police’ (as an institution). It is difficult to be certain to which one Victor is referring in every occasion. In Norway, applications for work and residence permits can be presented at the local police station, and not necessarily at immigration authorities (UDI). The district's police office has the authority to decide on

simple cases where legislation is directly applied, and forwards the more demanding cases that require an interpretation of the law, or where the applicants do not directly fulfill the requirements, to UDI. In Oslo, there is a specific police office that deals with migration matters (Utledningsseksjonen), since Oslo is the largest city of the country with the largest proportion of the immigrant population (cf. 1.1). This narrative is situated at both the police station and at UDI at different moments (lines 31 and 57, correspondingly). The people that work at both these offices are not usually police officers, but executive officers that deal with the applications. In the narrative, the reference to the police (line 46) can be interpreted as both the institution and a person, in a concrete or more abstract level. It can be argued that this ambiguity in the referent is part of Victor's point: that 'the police', the concrete individual and the institution through its representatives, questioned his identification as a Norwegian, and that this narrative reflected a praxis extended to other Norwegians institutions. This analysis of the voice of *la policía*, makes the constructed nature of quotation in narrative evident (Tannen 2007), not to mention the language of choice for introducing other voices. The situation narrated by Victor actually occurred in Norwegian, at a Norwegian office, so the verbalization of the experience in Spanish already implies a reformulation which is far from the idea of quotation.

The theme introduced in the narrative actions is that of language proficiency in relation to the ascription of the category *Norwegian* (lines 50-52). The police questioned Victor's self-identification as Norwegian at the police office due to his lack of command of the Norwegian language. Language is formulated as an essential characteristic for ascribing the category Norwegian at an institutional level in this narrative. This formulation seems to reflect larger, transnational processes of dissociation between citizenship and nationality, which have to do with "[the] separation between the state's administrative procedures to define individuals as full citizens and the social processes of integration and recognition as members of the national group" (Pujolar 2007: 79). In the current context of intensified migration at a global scale, and in relation to regional supranational organisms such as the European Union (of which Norway is not a member), and the European Economic Area,⁸ citizenship and nationality are not easily predictable for individuals. Thus, Norwegian citizens are not necessarily ethnic or culturally *Norwegians*,

⁸ Norway is member of the EEA (European Economic Area), a European organism that is based on free movement of people, goods, services, and capital across the borders of its member countries.

as it was made clear in the debate regarding the definition of Norwegians as equal to ‘ethnic Norwegians’ by the Norwegian Language Council (Språkrådet):

A Pakistani who settles in Norway does not become Norwegian, not even if he becomes a Norwegian citizen. He will remain Pakistani. The Norwegian belong to their group and the Pakistani to theirs. But both can of course belong to the group “Norwegian citizen” (Excerpt from an email from the Norwegian Language Council, translated and quoted by Lane 2009: 214)⁹

The category *Norwegian* is defined by a linguistic criterion in Victor’s narrative: a Norwegian speaks Norwegian; in line with the categorization of characters across a linguistic axis in Susana B, analyzed above (cf. 4.1.2). There is an implicit national romantic ideal of the language as ‘the spirit of a nation’ which, according to Lane (2009), still remains current, though challenged, at several institutional levels in Norwegian society. Social actors cannot only contest institutional accounts of citizenship categorization, but also appropriate and redefine the uses of social categories.

In the narrative, Victor is not recognized as a Norwegian in linguistic, cultural terms, because he does not speak Norwegian, and because of that, he is challenged in obtaining legal recognition as a Norwegian citizen at the immigration office. This narrative introduces a conflict situation in which different conceptions of the category *Norwegian* are presented and contrasted. Victor is not only not recognized as a Norwegian in cultural or ethnic terms (something he might agree with in the sense he presents himself as *technically* Norwegian), but he is also questioned in his right to claim the same legal status as a *true* Norwegian. His argument is that he is discriminated against because he is challenged in executing his rights as a Norwegian citizen.

After this passage, Victor takes a two and a half seconds long pause that leads to the moderator’s taking the turn. She asks more questions about the situation, looking for an evaluation of the events recently narrated, which leads to a series of negotiations between Victor and the moderator regarding the conclusion of the narrative

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 53 | M | porque no podías hablar = | 53 | M | because you couldn't speak= |
| 54 | V | =no porque no sabi- no sabía hablar en noruego asique no era noruego yo (.) | 54 | V | =because I cou- I couldn't speak Norwegian then I wasn't a Norwegian I (.) |
| 55 | | yo no era noruego, osea en- (2.36) | 55 | | I wasn't a Norwegian, I mean en-(2.36) |
| 56 | M | eso fue fue una persona en concreto que te dijo eso= | 56 | M | that was was a concrete person who told you that= |
| 57 | V | =policía en la <i>udi</i> | 57 | V | =police (woman) at <i>udi</i> (acronym for |

⁹ It should be clarified that Sylfest Lomheim, then director of Språkrådet, later retracted the board’s position on the definition of ‘Norwegian’ and offered a public apology.

58	cuando fui a sacar el- cuando fui a pedir los papeles para (1.56) para el ob- opps- <i>oppholdstillatelse</i> de la Violeta	58	immigration authority) when I went to get the- when I went to ask for the papers to (1.56) for (presenting) the opps- <i>oppholdstillatelse</i> (residence permit) for Violeta
59	°sí no fue	59	°yeah it was
60	fui a pedir ese papel ese certificado	60	I went to ask for that paper that certificate
61	M y qué d- te dijo directamente así	61	M and what d- did she say to you straight forward:
62	“no entonces tú- entonces no es noruego” @	62	“no then you- then he is not Norwegian”@
63	V no quizás- no sé si no me dijo es- osea	63	V no maybe- I don't know if she told- I mean
64	m- me dijo entonces como	64	she told me then something like:
65	“qué tipo de noruego es”	65	“then what kind of a Norwegian is he,”
66	osea como (.) qué (1)	66	I mean like (.) what (1)
67	“qué me estás hablando o sea si no sabe hablar noruego” (4.27)	67	“what are you talking about if he doesn't even speak Norwegian-” (4.27)

Victor's narrative at the moment of the pause (line 52) is unfinished, since no final evaluation, closing comments or *coda* are presented. In this excerpt, we see how the moderator tries to get Victor to continue narrating by asking more detailed questions, to which Victor responds by providing background information and eventually gives up the turn by remaining silent. Susana then takes the turn and proposes a different interpretation of the events of the narrative, based on the standardized procedures of applying for Norwegian citizenship as a foreigner.

68	S sí es que yo creo que- no sé cómo es el proceso este	68	S yeah I think that- I don't know how the process is
69	pero si tú vas a pedir el <u>pasapo;rte</u> noruego para ser <u>noruego</u> ,	69	but if you apply for a <u>Norwegian</u> passport to become <u>Norwegian</u>
70	tienes que demostrar que sabes <u>noruego</u> ,	70	you have to prove that you speak <u>Norwegian</u> ,
71	y que has ido al <u>curso</u> tantas horas si es que	71	and that you took a <u>course</u> that lasted so many hours
72	entonces de repente entonces por eso pensó, o sea “cómo,	72	then maybe that's why he/she thought, I mean “how,
73	entonces puede ser noruego si es que no sabes noruego [si es que no has] =	73	then he can't be Norwegian if you don't speak Norwegian [if you havn't]=
74	V [claro]	74	V: [sure]
75	S =ido al curso si es que no has demostrado que puedes”=	75	S = been to the course if you haven't demonstrated that you can”=
76	V =que yo nas- nació acá	76	V =I was born here
77	entonces era como empezar a explicarle toda mi vida[para que osea]	77	then it was like I had to tell him/her my life story [so that I mean]
78	S [mhm claro]	78	S [mhm claro]

Susana contests Victor's argument of presenting the narrative as a case of discrimination, by opposing another interpretation of the story. Susana suggests that the suspicion about

Victor's citizenship is done on the background of the requirements imposed on immigrants who wish to become Norwegian citizens: language proficiency requirements. Immigrants that apply to become Norwegian citizens must document that they have attended at least three hundred hours of Norwegian courses (UDI 2011a), or document that they have sufficient knowledge of the language. Victor quickly dismisses Susana's interpretation by stating that he was born in Norway and therefore had a Norwegian citizenship.¹⁰ In this passage we see how the narrative is co-constructed by three participants, Victor, the moderator and Susana. Victor does not introduce an evaluative passage after the complicating event in the narrative, that the police woman claimed that Victor was not a Norwegian (line 52). In Labov's structural model of narrative, one of the essential elements of narrative is the evaluation (cf. 2.3.1), which is often fulfilled through an open evaluative passage after the complicating action, though this is not the only form of evaluation in narrative. I will not argue that a narrative without an evaluation passage after the complicating action is not a complete narrative, but rather suggest that the active co-construction of the narrative with other participants in this passage might be related to the absence of a clear evaluation that introduces Victor's stance regarding the narrated events; and thus opens the floor for the intervention of the other participants.

After these negotiations regarding the evaluation of the narrative, Victor takes a step out of the story world and introduces a generalized moral stance about how it is for him to be categorized in Norway:

79	V	eso es una cosa que aca es impresionante. osea	79	V	that's something quite amazing here. I mean
80		como que no se pueden explicar que hayan personas que: (1.4)	80		that they can't understand that there might be people that (1.4)
81		tú tienes que <u>siempre</u> dar la explicación de qué es lo que eres, de qué -	81		you <u>always</u> have to explain what it is that you are, what -
82		de por qué hablas <u>mal</u> de por qué hablas bien	82		why you speak so <u>badly</u> why you speak so well
83		si hablas bien también te preguntan "por qué hablas tan bien,"	83		if you speak well they also ask you "why do you speak so well"
84	S	"por qué hablas xxx"	84	S	why do you speak xxx
85	V	sí @@ es que <u>siempre</u> hay algo ah,	85	V	yes @@ there's <u>always</u> something right,
86		o te pareces <u>mucho</u> a nosotros o te pareces <u>muy poco</u> ,	86		you are either <u>a lot</u> like us or <u>very little</u> ,
87		pero siempre enco- em en relación a	87		but always in relation to them (1.1)

¹⁰ There are several prerequisites for having the birth right to Norwegian citizenship, other than just being born in the country. In Norway, as in most of Europe, citizenship rights are rather obtained through kinship, or 'jus sanguinis'. Victor does not problematize this here, but the fact that he is a Norwegian citizen without having applied to become one as an adult might indicate that his father or mother is one as well, rather than because he was born in Norway.

	ellos (1.1)		
88	ob- o para bien o para mal. (0.6)	88	for better or worse. (0.6) youknow (J:
	meentiendes (J: mhm)		mhm)
89	y así es todo el rato es siempre eso	89	and it's like that all the time li:ke
	como:		
90	“o eres <i>flink</i> , o ere: o eres malo.	90	"you are either <i>flink</i> (clever) or bad
91	o eres bueno, o eres tonto.	91	you're good or dumb
92	o eres feo, o eres lindo.	92	you're ugly or good looking
93	o eres a: alegre, o eres muy callado.	93	you're happy or too quiet
94	eres raro, o eres -"	94	you're weird or -"
95	siempre es como en comparación con	95	always in comparison to something
	algo		
96	con algo que que ellos consideran que es	96	to something they consider that is <u>normal</u>
	<u>normal</u> (S-M-J: mhm)		(S-M-J: mhm)
97	una normalidad creo yo (1.3)	97	a normality I think (1.3)
98	asique así era y (.)	98	so that's how it was a:nd (.)
99	tener como todo el rato que: demostrar	99	having like to prove all the time tha:t to
	que uno es de verdad que @		prove that one is for real that @
100	[no sé]@	00	[I don't know]
101	S [sí]	01	S [yes]

Victor is clearly aware of the experience of being categorized, being ascribed categories and thus defined in someone else's terms. He returns to the topic of language knowledge by making an evaluation from the present time of the interview and no longer from the narrative time (lines 82-83), to what Susana responds supportively with a repetition or reformulation (line 84). He argues for a constant need of definition, of self-identification, by explaining who one is, or by being ascribed qualities (lines 90-96). Once more, Victor resorts to constructed dialogue to dramatically illustrate his point. In this case he introduces the voice of a generalized Norwegian, representative of "them", who categorizes Victor following pre-established categories (*flink*, bad, good, happy, sad, etc.) The experience of being evaluated and categorized is quite strong in Victor's formulation of his experiences in Norway. During this entire closing passage, Victor changes the use of pronouns from the protagonist of the narrative *yo* 'I', to an inclusive and generalizing second person *tú* 'you', thus orienting his evaluations towards the other participants. This is a natural shift in narrative as codas, or closing sections of the narratives, fulfill the function of reconnecting the interaction with the present of the interaction and leaving the story world behind (cf. 2.3.1). In this movement, the change of pronouns in an order relevant to the interactional situation is fairly expected as De Fina (2003: 85) points out. Nevertheless, De Fina analyzes changes in the use of pronouns in codas (changes to *tú*, *nosotros*, and *uno*) as 'collectivization' of the experience, in our case by involving the hearer. The strategy of collectivization of the experience has the effect of generalizing the

actions, so that the narrated events concern not only Victor but also the other participants. Victor closes this narrative with “so that’s how it was” and adds a comment, but eventually gives up his turn. Immediately after this narrative, and maybe also for showing solidarity to him after having challenged Victor’s evaluation of his narrative (lines 68-73), Susana introduces the narrative Susana A as a second story (Sacks 1992), which is analyzed below in 4.2.3.

According to De Fina (2006), group identity is both represented and negotiated in narratives, and in this process of situated identity construction (Bauman 2000), speakers share and challenge schematic representations of social groups and categories that have roots in ideologies and beliefs about them. In this narrative, Victor problematizes the meaning and functioning of the category *noruego*: as a category that creates the image of a cultural and/or ethnic homogeneous group, but that falls short of describing cases like himself. Victor voices a claim for being seen as an individual, not a pre-established category: ‘technically Norwegian, not true Norwegian; but Chilean: a foreigner, with a Norwegian passport.’ In this narrative Victor positions himself in opposition to the stereotypical or prototypical image of the Norwegian, one who is linguistically, culturally and ethnic Norwegian, but at the same time claims his right to being recognized as a Norwegian citizen and not being cast suspicion upon. In this sense, Victor constructs a “hybrid” identity (Bhabha 1994) for himself, one that challenges the limits of abstract cultural categories, *Norwegian* and *foreigner*, and their implicit stereotypes.

Victor’s character is given no voice in the narrative, as he lacks the symbolic means (the language) that provides him with a voice and thus lacks agency (Blommaert 2005). The lack of voice, of knowledge of Norwegian, hinders the character of Victor in the exercise of his rights as a Norwegian citizen, as he is categorized as non-Norwegian. As in Susana B(cf. 4.1.2), Victor C (cf. 4.1.3), and Juana A (cf. 4.2.1) the characters in this narrative are categorized on the basis of language proficiency and the assigning of the category label *Norwegian* is done along the axis of language.

The two antagonists in the story: Victor and *la policía*, represent two groups: *extranjero* and *noruego*, which are categorized on the axis of language proficiency. The limits for the assignment of the category *noruego* are problematized in the narrative through the narrated events in which Victor is suspected of illegitimately claiming to be a Norwegian

citizen, and in the ambivalent self-assignment of the category label *noruego* which is followed by an explicit distance (the hedging and laughter).

Victor A introduces a story of nationality categorization where the definition of a *true* member of the group *Norwegian* is problematized. Victor cleverly marks the restrictive limits in the assignment of this category label, as he constructs a hybrid identity for himself through taking a distant stance from the self-assignment of the label *Norwegian*. Victor manages to construct an individual identity on the basis of and in opposition to the national categories *Norwegian* and *foreigner*. This analysis showed how implicit representations of group categories are not merely reductionist labels for individuals, but that they can also function as a strategy for constructing and conveying an individual's stance.

4.2.3 Susana A

This narrative emerged immediately after Victor A's closing sequences and as a response to the moral stance on the experience of being categorized as a foreigner. Susana supports the position constructed in Victor A by offering a *second story* (Sacks 1992: 769) that backs Victor's arguments, since second stories emerge in conversation as "in hearing what another person says, one is 'reminded of' not just any experiences, but such experiences as an analysis of whatever they yield." The second story's topic or point needs to be relevant to the first narrative in some manner, so Susana A is initially framed as a story of Norwegian's attitudes towards foreigners. The numbering of the clauses for Victor A and Susana A is continuous in order to index the relation between these two narratives.

Susana A is not as close to being a canonical narrative as those previously analyzed, but is rather an *other-oriented* narrative in which the narrators "underplay their personal role in the story to emphasize the extraordinary nature of things that happen in the tale." (Stahl 1983: 270, quoted in De Fina 2008) Susana introduces a story that has two co-workers of Susana as their main characters and places herself as the narrator and witness/evaluator of the action sequence. Susana A introduces some interesting categorizations.

102	S	(00.21.30) no es que yo también creo	102	S	(00.21.30) no is that I also believe that
		que los noruegos osea (1.1)			Norwegians I mean (1.1)
103		a parte que viven en una burbuja, (0.7)	103		besides the fact that they live in a bubble,
					(0.7)

104	se creen el centro del mundo, (V:@) no,	104	they believe that they are the center of the universe, (V:@) right,
105	los mejores no, osea (2.14) (comiendo)	105	the best ones right, I mean (2.14) (eating)
106	y como tu dices osea	106	and like you say I mean
107	en mi trabajo hay muchos este:	107	at my work there are a lot of eh:
	inmigrantes de diferentes culturas (1.3)		immigrants from different cultures (1.3)
108	y muchos musulmanes	108	and a lot of Muslims
109	y entonces uno de ellos le dijo a la otra a una musulmana que había llevado una <u>revista</u>	109	and then one of them told the other one to a Muslim woman that had brought with her a <u>magazine</u>
110	°de dónde de: dónde de Marruecos creo (1.4)	110	°from where from: where from Morocco I think (1.4)
111	y dijo- y vio las fotos	111	and said- and she saw the pictures
112	y dijo “ah pero allá en Marruecos también se visten <u>normales</u> entonces.” (V-M: @)	112	and said “oh but over there in Morocco you also dress <u>normal</u> then.” (V-M:@)
113	y yo cómo “qué- cómo le va a decir eso” osea	113	and I how “what- how can you say that to her” I mean
114	entonces la otra “sí no es que no todos somos <u>anormales</u> pues” le dijo osea @@	114	I mean then the other one “yeah no the thing is that not all of us are <u>abnormal</u> ” then she told her I mean @@
115	me entiendes, osea para ellos la comparación de osea se ponen <u>jeans</u> y pantalones las mujeres también allá osea	115	you know, I mean to them the comparison between I mean they wear <u>jeans</u> and pants women over there too I mean
116	no todas andan con los con los ve:los y los vestidos no, pero- (1.3)	116	not everyone goes around with the ve:ils and dresses right, but- (1.3)
117	osea hay que tener mucho <u>tacto</u> (J-V:mhm) mucho cuidado de lo que lo que uno dice osea “normal”	117	I mean you have to have a lot of <u>tact</u> (J-V:mhm) to be careful with what what one says I mean “normal”
118	igual para ellos nosotros podemos ser anormales porque no: (0.7)	118	likewise to them we can be abnormal because we do: n't (0.7)
119	porque usamos <u>jeans</u> y y: verdad, o sea	119	because we wear <u>jeans</u> and a:nd right, I mean

The fact that this narrative is a ‘second story’ for Victor A is evident in the interactional passage that introduces the narrative as a supportive response to Victor’s closing evaluations (lines 102-105). Susana supports Victor’s stereotypical portray of Norwegians as naïve and little knowledgeable about the world and people outside of Norway with a direct reference to him through the pronoun *tú* in line 106.

Susana opens the narrative with an orientation section (lines 106-108) where the background for the situation is established: a work context where people of different cultural backgrounds and religions work together. The use of the category *inmigrante* “immigrant” in this narrative is the only one made by a participant in the entire interview. This category is introduced to characterize the multiethnic background of Susana’s workplace, together with the category *musulmanes* “Muslims”. The narrative action starts in line 109, when “one of them” makes a comment to a *musulmana* “Muslim woman”

from Morocco about a magazine she had brought to work. The referent for the pronoun *ellos* ‘them’ is *los noruegos* ‘the Norwegian’ (line 102).

The Moroccan woman in the story had brought a Moroccan magazine to work and the Norwegian character, which is presented in an extremely undetermined manner without specification for gender and merely “one of them” (line 109), commented that s/he was surprised that the women in the magazine’s pictures dressed “normal”. Susana uses the Norwegian’s voice in a direct quotation (line 112), stressing the label “normal”, as shown in the transcript. The other participants laugh and smile, and Susana quotes herself, as a witness to the actions of the narrative, performing evaluation of the Norwegian and condemning the use of the label “normal” (line 113). Then, the Moroccan woman is quoted as answering the Norwegian in an ironic tone and ridiculing the Norwegian’s categorization of the pictures in the magazine as “normal” (line 114). She does this by contesting this category with the notion of *anormal* “abnormal”, in a movement that puts in evidence the nature of the process of categorization: assigning the label “normal” to something is implicitly establishing that what does not fit that category must be categorized as its opposite (in a binary logic of binary features): “abnormal”. “Normality” in the voice of the Norwegian character is equaled to Norwegian or Western religious and cultural values, and “abnormal” as what does not fit into that label.

Susana supports this empowered position of the Moroccan character in her overt evaluations of the narrative (line 113), but, quite interestingly, she aligns herself with the character of the Norwegian in her use of pronouns (lines 115-119). Up to this point in the narrative, the use of pronouns had presented a narrated universe where two representatives of two antagonist groups confronted each other: one of the *Norwegians*, and one of the *immigrants* or *Muslims*. In the final evaluative sentences of the narrative (lines 118-119), where Susana introduces a hypothetical narrative in which “one of them”, a Muslim, would be the one categorizing his or her “other”, Susana positions herself alongside the Norwegian, forming a *nosotros* ‘us’. This distinction is done across the lines of clothing customs, some groups being expected to wear “veils and dresses”, and the other one “jeans”. This opposition in clothing is symbolic of a religious opposition or distinction between Muslims and Christians, where Susana places herself in the Norwegian side, the Christian side.

De Fina (2003: 51) analyzes the use of pronouns in Mexican migrants' narratives as a means of assessing speakers' *social orientation*, which she defines as "the position of the speaker with respect to the dimensions of interdependence versus autonomy and of personalization versus depersonalization of experience." De Fina's focus in the analysis is placed on group identities, and her analysis of the use of pronouns aims at tracing individuals' group representations and the consequent positionings they take in relation to them. Since the focus of this thesis is not group identities but rather individuals' local negotiation and construction of identity, I analyze the use of pronouns to trace positioning movements vis-à-vis other participants. The pronouns can be indexical of the stances participants take in relation to the categorizations presented in the narratives. In this case, Susana introduces the narrative with a direct reference in second person to Victor (line 106), expressing solidarity towards him. Susana evaluates the actions of the narrative in a manner that shows solidarity with the character of the Moroccan woman, but takes a stance alongside the *noruegos* to form a *nosotros* "we" on the basis of the religious identity Christian in the final evaluation of the narrative.

From a voice perspective, all characters in the narrative are given voice equally, and most importantly the character of the Moroccan woman that is met with a stereotype by her Norwegian coworker is able to reposition herself in relation to the stereotype by ironically distancing herself from it. The stereotypes implicit in the narrative and which need to be available to all participants and readers so that they understand the sequence of actions in the narrative are: "Muslim women dress differently than in 'Western' societies", that is, they cover their body and hair (with veils and dresses), and "all Moroccans are Muslims." If we, as participants or readers, are not familiar with these stereotypes, the narrative sequences would not be clear to us, as we would not understand that there is an underlying relation between being from Morocco, being a Muslim woman and dressing according to religious rules, which creates an expectation that the media, such as a magazine, in that country will reflect these stereotypical aspects of a Moroccan identity. This expectation, assigned in the narrated universe to the character of the Norwegian thus portraying her/him as little knowledgeable of the diversity existent in foreign countries, is essential to understanding the narrative. The Norwegian is portrayed as naïve, and therefore applies reductionist stereotypes to individuals with whom s/he interacts, in line with Victor's representation of the character of the Norwegian interviewer in Victor B (cf. 4.1.1). In both these narratives the characters identified as Norwegians in work-related

settings are the ones in charge of categorizing, of asking questions that imply or expect actions or values that are predictable from a stereotype.

Susana A is a short, non-canonical narrative that enriches the analysis of categorization strategies because it introduces a distinction between different migratory groups that does not appear in any other narrative. This constellation of categories, in which the label *Muslims* enters the scene along with *immigrant* and *Norwegian*, differs from the category labels introduced in the other narratives of the corpus. There is no overt categorization of Susana's character as a witness of the story. Nevertheless much is to be learned about self categorization by paying attention to the categorization of others, as the representations of social relations and of members of other groups are essential aspects of group membership (van Dijk 1998; De Fina 2006), and "performing specific forms of "othering" is an ingredient of many forms of identity performance" (Blommaert 2005: 208). In the narrative we have just analyzed, Susana positions herself in opposition to the categories introduced: she distances herself from the Norwegian's lack of cultural awareness or sensitivity, and in opposition to the religious categorization of the Moroccan woman as *Muslim*. In this sense we could interpret Susana's positioning as the construction of a "middle position" in the Norwegian migration landscape: as not part of the absolute other, the Muslim immigrants, but neither part of the Norwegians. This position corresponds with the one Juana takes in the introduction of Victor B (cf. 4.1.1) on the "uncategorizable" position of Latinos, thus showing support for this formulation.

4.2.4 Juana B

This narrative was the first one to be produced as a response to the question "What was your best and worst experience in Norway?" followed by Susana B and Victor C which were already analyzed in section 4.1.

01 M e: qué les voy a preguntar ahora,
02 así e: tienen que pensar @@
03 cuál pueden decir que ha sido la mejor
y la peor experiencia que han tenido en
Noruega,
04 estoy pensando así experiencia
05 algo que les pasó
06 J pero es mas a nivel personal: e: osea
07 o en relación a: (.) >a algo que nos haya
sucedido<
08 bueno nosé [un poquito] difícil.
09 M [algo]

01 M e: what am I going to ask you now,
02 like e: you have to think @@
03 what would you say was the best and
worst experience you have had in
Norway
04 I am thinking like an experience
05 something that happened to you
06 J but its like at a personal level e: I mean
07 or in relation to: (.) >to something that
happened to us<
08 well I don't know [it's a bit] difficult
09 M [something]

10	algo que te que te haya sucedido o puede ser (.)	10	something that happened to you or it can be (.)
11	haber <u>visto</u> algo o haber @ estado involucrado en algo lo que sea	11	having <u>seen</u> something or having @ been involved in something whatever (15.4)
12	y en term- o sea la mejor y peor experiencia en términos muy amplios	12	and in relat- I mean the best and worst experience in very general terms
13	puede ser en relación a (.) cualquier cosa (15.4)	13	it can be in relation to (.) anything (15.4)
14	J (01.03.09) pus yo no sé si hay o sea algo- algo que digas lo- (.) <u>lo peor</u>	14	J (01.03.09) well I don't know if there is something that you would say the- (.) <u>the worst</u>
15	no sé si sea pero: (0.6)	15	I don't know if it is bu:t (0.6)
16	pero sí he tenido varias experiencias en donde: (0.7) el el <u>idioma</u> (.) no, me ha limitado mucho,	16	but I have had several experiences whe:re (0.7) the the <u>language</u> (.) right, has limited me a lot,
17	tal vez y que o sea que han sido momentos muy molestos	17	maybe that I mean those have been really annoying situations

There was some uncertainty as to what type of answer the moderator was seeking, as shown in the negotiation on the formulation of the question between Juana and the moderator (lines 06-13). There was a fifteen seconds long silence (measured in the digital version of the transcription with Transcriber) where participants didn't propose any answer, until Juana took the turn. Juana breaks the silence by introducing an abstract for two stories she frames as stories of language difficulties or problems (line 16-17). I will analyze these stories as one narrative since they both support the same arguments and were produced embedded in one another, thus sharing some of the same evaluative passages. This narrative is an *institutional encounter* narrative that introduces two experiences with health service personnel over the phone. As a first example Juana presents a story of the day she went into labor with her first child.

18	J como por ejemplo el: día que el día que <u>di a luz</u> no, @	18	J like for example the: day I <u>gave birth</u> right, @
19	a mi hija que tuve que llamar al hospital para ver qué (.) qué es lo que iba: que iba a suceder,	19	to my daughter and I had to call the hospital to see what(.) what was go:ing what was going to happen
20	y me contestó una mujer que era- no era noruega era sueca,	20	and a woman answered who was- wasn't Norwegian she was Swedish,
21	y me hablaba en <u>sueco</u> ,	21	and she was speaking to me in <u>Swedish</u> ,
22	y yo no entendía <u>nada</u> ,	22	and I couldn't understand <u>anything</u> ,
23	y estaba con los dolores de parto, y: (0.6)	23	and I was with labor pains, a:nd (0.6)
24	y fue muy humillante que que m- ella me hablaba mal,	24	and it was very humiliating that that m- she was speaking badly (in a bad manner) to me,
25	y que: (.) no quería que- hablar con mi esposo, porque quería que <u>yo</u> le hablara	25	and tha:t (.) she didn't want to talk to my husband, because she wanted <u>me</u> to talk to her
26	pero yo no le entendía	26	but I couldn't understand her
27	y no me tenía la paciencia no,	27	and she didn't have any patience right,
28	y yo tampoco tenía	28	and nor did I

29	no estaba n- @ de humor ni (0.8)	29	I wasn't n- @ in the mood nor (0.8)
30	ni nada como para para lidiar con ella no,	30	nor anything to to be able to deal with her right,
31	eso me acuerdo mucho que fue muy frustrante.	31	that I remember well it was very frustrating
32	<u>muy muy</u> frustrante.	32	<u>very very</u> frustrating.

The narrative action starts at the moment Juana phoned the hospital to ask for instructions and a Swedish woman answered, speaking in Swedish, and Juana could not understand her (lines 20-22). Juana evaluates the actions and character as that the woman had “no patience” with her and spoke “in a bad manner” (lines 24 and 27 correspondingly). Juana was not able to deal with the language difficulties of speaking Norwegian with a Swede, and since she was having labor pains, she tried to give the phone over to her husband, a Norwegian who would have been able to understand Swedish (line 25). The nurse refused, since she wanted Juana to explain herself and not through an interpreter. Juana evaluates the whole experience as extremely frustrating and humiliating (lines 31-32), as she was not in a position for dealing with the Swedish woman while in labor (lines 29-30).

In this story world, the character of the woman who answered the phone is presented through the categories *non-Norwegian* and *Swedish*, and as the antagonist in the narrated universe. Juana evaluates the fact that the nurse spoke Swedish as problematic, signaled through emphasis and rising intonation (lines 21-22). The conflict lies in that the antagonist expected and demanded Juana to understand her, as she did not accept to communicate through an interpreter. In the context introduced by the story world, it was expected that speakers of Norwegian would understand Swedish.

Due to the regional economic situation in Scandinavia, Swedish workers often migrate to Norway in search of higher wages, both for seasonal and more permanent positions. Until recently, Swedish workers constituted the biggest immigration group, recently displaced by Polish seasonal workers (SSB 2010). Sweden and Norway have a common historical and cultural past; they share similar political and educational systems, and speak languages that are closely related so that they are mutually intelligible, though this is contested. In practical terms, workers speaking either Swedish or Danish can apply for a position in Norway without requiring any validation of studies or language proficiency tests, and Scandinavian students at Norwegian higher education institutions are allowed to write exams, papers, and theses in either Danish or Swedish. Still, there are contrasting

differences between these languages and comprehending Swedish or Danish with knowledge of Norwegian as a second language is not easy as problematized in this narrative.

Juana introduces an open evaluation of this story where she refers to the conflict in more clear terms:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>33 J que: (.) que que se da mucho por hecho
aquí que que porque hablas noruego,
entonces vas a entender sueco, o vas a
entender danés (S:@) no,
34 y no necesariamente. no,
35 osea especialmente cuando te m:
hablan: (.)
36 osea bueno ne- especialmente en un
momento como ése en lo que (S:hm)
37 nor- lo que menos estas pensando es en
es en el idioma en el que estás hablando
no, (1.1)</p> | <p>33 J that that it is taken for granted here that
that because you speak Norwegian then
you'll be able to understand Swedish, or
you will understand Danish (S: @) right,
34 and not necessarily. right,
35 I mean especially when they m: talk to
you (over the phone) (.)
36 I mean well especially in a moment like
that in when (S:hm)
37 nor- the last thing on your mind is the
language you are speaking in right, (1.1)</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The evaluation of the narrative proposes that the conflict of the narrative lies in the expectation that all Norwegian speakers will understand Swedish. If the implicit ideal for language proficiency in Norwegian is passive comprehension of other Scandinavian languages in institutional settings like the hospital, then speakers of Norwegian as a second language might not be evaluated as proficient in Norwegian. The use of the inclusive second person in the last evaluative passage of the story (lines 33-37) shows Juana's orientation to the other participants who in turn provide affirmative feedback signaling agreement with her. The switch to the second person also generalizes the narrative to include the participants and implicitly others in her position.

I have previously pointed out that speaking Norwegian was a category bound activity for *Norwegian*, and that the categories *Norwegian* and *foreigner* were often established through a language proficiency criterion. In the action sequences of this narrative, Juana is implicitly categorized as a *foreigner*, as someone with low or non-sufficient language proficiency in Norwegian, on the grounds of comprehension of Swedish. In contrast, the character of the Swedish woman speaks fluently a language that is contextually appropriate for the situation and can be thus categorized as *Norwegian*, or in a role equal to Norwegian. In this sense, this narrative introduces a story world in which the *Norwegian* category is closely related to the *Swedish* one, as characters identified with these categories have similar types of agency: speaking Norwegian and Swedish and

being contextually appropriate in institutional settings. Hence, in the open evaluation of the story Juana positions herself in contrast to the categorizations implicit in the action sequences of the narrative we analyzed in the previous paragraph.

In the categorizations introduced in the action sequences (line 20), Juana introduces her antagonist as *non-Norwegian* thus *Swedish*, and in the open evaluation of the story (lines 33-37) she argues that it is unrealistic to expect that people with command of Norwegian will understand Swedish (and Danish). In these two passages Juana “others” the Swedes and Swedish language as *non-Norwegian* thus *foreign*, and places herself in a higher status position than that of her antagonist. Juana speaks “Norwegian” in Norway and should not have to have her proficiency evaluated in the terms of a foreign language, as she implicitly evaluates. In the categorizations implied in the action sequences of the narrative on the other hand, Juana is the one “othered” as a foreigner on the basis of language proficiency. In this sense, this story introduces two contrasting images of the nature of a linguistic conflict: one in the sequence of actions, according to which the conflict lies in Juana not being able to understand Swedish; and another in the evaluation, in which it is problematic that a Swede can answer the phone at a hospital and expect and demand to be understood as if she had been speaking Norwegian. Depending on the ideological perspective taken, the actions portrayed in the narrative can be seen a case of an individual’s language difficulties in Norway (language difficulty narrative), or a case of a language conflict that is representative of a larger conflict at a social scale (language conflict narrative). This narrative thus portrays a conflict that illustrates the contrast between a particular Norwegian language ideology and the reality of migration.

We will now see how this conflict regarding language proficiency is further problematized in the analysis of the next story, in which Juana introduces the second example of experiences where language proficiency and communicative performance were a limitation or source of conflict. In this story she called the doctor’s office to make an appointment to have some examination done:

38 J y por el estilo he tenido o- otras
experiencias no,
39 también (.)
40 normalmente son por teléfono no,
41 con gente que: que te: que- que se
molesta porque no los entiendes
e:(1.35)
42 la última fue e-

38 J and I have had other experiences like that
right,
39 also (.)
40 usually over the phone right,
41 with people tha:t tha:t that get angry
because you don't understand them
e:(1.35)
42 the last one was e-

43	hablé para (.) hacer una cita unos análisis en el doctor y: (.)	43	I made a call to make an appointment with the doctor for some analysis a:nd
44	y lo mismo no me creían no, que tenía una hoja que me había dado el medico	44	and the same they didn't believe me right, that I had a paper that the doctor had given me
45	y querían que que mi esposo hablara con ellos. no,	45	and they wanted my husband to talk to them right,
46	porque normalmente osea “no no es que no le entiendo “	46	because normally I mean “no no I can't understand you
47	no, y bueno dije “por el amor de dios osea (S:@)	47	right, y well I said for the love of god I mean (S:@)
48	yo digo voy a la universidad y-	48	I say I attend the university and-
49	>y cómo no me puede entender le estoy diciendo <	49	>and how can you not understand what I am saying<
50	osea le estoy pidiendo una <u>cita</u> ”	50	I mean I am asking for an <u>appointment</u> ”
51	“no no pero es que este: no-” osea	51	“no no but is that no-” I mean
52	mi esposo tuvo que hablar al final de cuentas	52	my husband had to talk at the end
53	y eso fue hace dos días no,	53	and this was two days ago right,
54	entonces por eso también lo tengo muy reciente.	54	then this is also why I have it quite present

The narrative action starts immediately after the introduction (lines 38-41), with Juana calling to make an appointment to the doctor's office (line 43). The answer to her call was that “they” did not believe Juana had a referral from another doctor and wanted to talk to her husband (lines 44-45). This story presents the opposite situation from the first one, as in this story the assistant, the antagonist, is the one who cannot understand Juana and is willing to talk to Juana's husband. The phrase “the same” (line 44) generalizes the story and thus frames it as part of a normality— the same that happens every time (line 46). She uses a plural third person to refer to the assistant who had answered the phone, thus extending the attitude of disbelief in Juana's words to the entire doctor's office and not just an individual, and also making it part of the same institutional experience with *them*, a habitual story.

Thereafter, Juana introduces a dialogue in her voice and the doctor's assistant's. In line 46, the voice of the assistant is used to state that she could not understand what Juana was saying in the form of a direct quotation. The assistant's voice is introduced by the adverbial “usually,” which once more generalizes this particular story to a habitual event: people usually cannot understand Juana. There is contrast between the introduction of the story that framed it as a story of Juana not understanding other people, with this generalization of the inverse experience in which people do not understand Juana.

The narrative action continues with Juana's answer to this quote, and her own voice is introduced as she manages to stand up for herself and state her proficiency (lines 47-51). Juana is an educated woman who attends graduate school at a Norwegian university, thus attending classes in Norwegian and giving proof of having sufficient proficiency in Norwegian. However, people cannot (or will not?) understand her over the phone. Juana evaluates the narrative through constructed dialogue and in giving herself voice and repositions herself as an educated woman. The story is resolved in that Juana finally gives up and hands the phone over to her husband.

55	pero eso es de lo más molesto no,	55	but that is the most annoying thing right,
56	que cuando la gente te trata (.) así	56	that when people treat you (.) like that
57	osea que cuando te sient-	57	I mean when you feel-
58	cuando te hablan como un niño no,	58	when they talk to you like a child right,
59	porque eso es algo xxx que me molesta mucho,	59	because that is something xxx that bothers me a lot
60	que que te hablen como si tuvieras cinco años	60	that they talk to you as if you were five years old
61	que te hablen así todo <u>le:nto</u> y todo	61	that they talk to you all <u>slo:wly</u> and all
62	porque n- porque eres extranjero, (.)	62	because n- you are a foreigner, (.)
63	o cuando te tratan mal porque no- porque no los entiendes no,	63	or when they treat you badly because you can't understand them right,
64	y realmente no es tu culpa (.)	64	and it's really not your fault (.)
65	no es tu - (.) osea	65	it is not your - (.) I mean
66	que hay muchos otros factores que que influyen en ese momento	66	that there are many other factors that that influence in that moment
67	eso es de lo peor no, (S: hm)	67	that's the worst right, (S: hm)
68	y lo mejor pues no sé (.)	68	and the best I don't know (.)
69	déjame pensar @ (M:@)	69	let me think @ (M:@)
	(15.6)		(15.6)

In the final evaluation of the story (lines 55-67), Juana changes again to a second person that fulfills the same evaluative and interactional functions pointed out above. She categorizes herself as a foreigner (line 62), and evaluates the sequence of actions of the narrative as determined by the fact that she was a foreigner. The present tense generalizes the evaluations to refer to a certain type of situation: being treated as a child, being spoken to in a demeaning manner due to a particular language performance. Juana refers to the first story told about the Swede, aligning both stories as examples of being humiliated, treated badly because of particular language proficiency: speaking a variety of Norwegian or not understanding Swedish.

Both stories presented in this narrative introduce action sequences that are related to language conflict and difficulties. This time, the narratives are not distant experiences of newcomers who did not speak any Norwegian, but experiences close to the present of the

interview, as shown in the evaluative use of verbal tense and adverbial modifiers. The categorizations of characters take place through the axis of language proficiency, identifying them as Norwegians and or foreigners at different moments and in reference to different types of contact variation. Juana cleverly repositions herself as a resourceful, proficient speaker of Norwegian in opposition to the implications of *foreigner* by referring to her academic background and giving proof of her command of Norwegian.

4.2.5 Discussion and conclusion for the analyses of institutional and service encounters narratives

We have now analyzed four narratives of institutional and service encounters. The three narratives presented above introduced experiences of interactions with representatives of Norwegian institutions or companies that were themselves identified as *Norwegians*. The protagonists of most of the narratives, the narrators, were positioned as antagonist to the *Norwegians* (or *Swedish* for the case of Juana B.) The categorization of the antagonists was done almost exclusively on linguistic grounds, being *Norwegian* and *foreigner*, defined as the opposite poles of a continuum scale or axis, with a middle position for *non-Norwegians* or *Swedes*. All of the complicating events in these narratives were related to a language conflict situation: not to be recognized as Norwegian for not speaking Norwegian, to be laughed at because of not speaking Norwegian, or to be humiliated for not understanding Swedish or speaking Norwegian with a foreign accent.

Furthermore, we found a clear orientation towards the other participants through the switch in the use of pronouns in the coda of the narratives, also analyzed as collectivization for the experience in De Fina (2003). The use of pronouns in Juana A the story placed at the kiosk (cf. 4.2.1) is especially intricate, as the first person singular *nosotros* is used in constant alternation with the second person *tú*, in subject and object forms, as well as in the verbal morphology. De Fina (2003) argues that this social orientation of the narratives towards framing personal stories as generalized accounts of the experiences of a group functions as a *deresponsabilization* strategy by which narrators are not responsible nor accountable for the result of sequences of events in the narratives, as these are examples of the normal experiences of a group. I have not found any indication that the use of pronouns in these narratives reflects De Fina's analysis, which also presented a large corpus of *nosotros* narratives where protagonists were introduced in the first person plural. For this corpus, we found most often a change to *tú* in the codas

of the narratives which we analyzed as generalization of the experience with an argumentative value.

5 Discussion and conclusion

Among the main goals of this thesis is the objective of assessing which categories were used in the narratives. In the previous chapter, we presented detailed analyses of a corpus of seven canonical narratives from an interactional and dimensional perspective. The analyses showed how categories of self- and other-identification were deployed in connection with their stereotypes, and the stances participants took in relation to these identifications. In this chapter, I will concentrate on the characteristics of the use of category labels across narratives and participants, in order to trace the trends in categorization by the participants in the focus group.

5.1 *Noruegos and extranjeros*

The identification of characters through social categories in the narratives was done in terms of nationality, religion, age, ethnicity and gender. Some of the categorizations were overtly performed, by ascribing a category label to a character in the story world, while others were done more implicitly through assigning “category bound activities.” In the analyses of the narratives, we saw that the category that were most often used were *noruego* “Norwegian” and *extranjero* “foreigner”. Table 5 presents the number of occurrences of the most often used category labels for the whole interview, the corpus, and the percentage of uses of categories that took place in the corpus, out of the total amount of occurrences in the interview:

Category Labels	Occurrences in the interview (including corpus)	Amount of uses in the corpus	Percentage of uses in the corpus
<i>Noruego/a-s</i>	71	23	32 %
<i>Extranjero/a-s</i>	36	10	27 %
<i>Musulmán</i>	6	4	66 %
<i>Latino/a-s</i>	7	2	28 %
<i>Inmigrante-s</i>	4	2	50 %

Table 5: Occurrences of category labels in the interview and corpus

The category labels that were most often used in both the corpus and the interview are *noruego* and *extranjero*, being *noruego* used twice as often as *extranjero*, both in the

interview as in the corpus. *Musulmán* “Muslim” would be the third most often used category in the corpus with four occurrences, while *Latino* and *inmigrante* with both two occurrences as well as the rest of the national category labels. These national labels are not introduced in Table 5 since they not only have few occurrences in the corpus, but also because they were not as salient in the overall analyses of the narratives as the other category labels. It should be noted that the quantification of frequency of occurrences of category is actually not a valid approach to the analysis of categorization in our data, as categorization is often done without assigning membership into a group but rather by assigning a category bound activity, as we saw in the analysis (see for example Susana B, cf 4.1.2). Also, the low number of occurrences of some category labels makes the validity of the presentation of percentages for the proportion of occurrences in the corpus questionable. Nevertheless, the contrasts in the proportion of uses of the different categories becomes more evident when quantified than in the detailed analyses, and we can compare the percentage of total uses of categories that took place in the corpus in relation to the interview. The percentage of occurrences of the two most frequent categories in the corpus is quite close (32% for *noruego* and 27% for *extranjero*), thus the contrast in the amount of occurrences in the corpus is representative for the whole interview. The occurrences of the category *Muslim* in the corpus on the other hand, represent over the 60 percent of the interview occurrences, thus this category can be said to be overrepresented in the corpus in relation to the interview.

The formulation of the research questions as well as the interview questions took the point of departure that the participants were both *immigrants* and *Latinos*. The analyses and Table 5 shows on the contrary, that *extranjero* and *noruego* are the preferred categories for self and other categorization in the corpus, and that *latino* and *inmigrante* were among the least used self-identification labels in the corpus, as fifty percent of their occurrences correspond to the questions of the moderator. The contrast between the researcher’s assumptions concerning the relevant categories for describing a group, and the groups’ self identifications in the interaction illustrates the relevance of constructionist approaches to identity which, in contrast to essentialist ones, give relevance to the individuals’ perceptions and formulations of themselves which can, as in this case, contrast with the researcher’s assumptions concerning the group (cf. 2.2).

Since the formulation of the research questions and the presentation of the participants made relevant their immigrant and Latino background, we must now consider the reasons for these categories not being used for self-identification. *Imigrante* was only used twice in the corpus, once by the moderator in Victor B, and once in Susana A, to introduce background information (cf.4.1.1 and 4.2.3, correspondingly). Regarding *latino*, this category label was also used twice in the corpus, both in Victor B: once in the moderator's question and once in the narrative, though this second occurrence takes place in a constructed dialogue passage assigned to the voice of the antagonist character (cf. 4.1.1). The detailed analyses of these narratives showed that these categories were not used as self-identification category labels.

The preferred self-identification category label was *extranjero*. In contrast to *inmigrante*, *extranjero* is a more neutral term as it does not imply a static or permanent settlement in the country, and does not refer to legal discourses on migration. Being an immigrant implies a specific legal status as the result of a bureaucratic process. *Extranjero* on the other hand, refers to someone's foreign origin: a tourist, seasonal worker, bag-packer, or permanent inhabitant. When asked about their futures in Norway, none of the participants thought of themselves living permanently there, though none of them had concrete plans for moving abroad at that moment. It can be argued that participants do not use *inmigrante* for self-identification because this category implies a more permanent status of migration in which they do not recognize themselves. Moreover, *inmigrante* resonates with political and media discourses regarding the problematization of migration in Norway. *Innvandrer* ("immigrant") in Norwegian, is heavily linked to official discourses on a specific group, defined in terms of "objective" social variables and thematized in institutional discourses for example in the Statistics Norway (SSB). The general media representation of the group often connects immigrants with negative and controversial issues, such as lack of integration, problematic distribution of gender roles according to Norwegian values, violence, criminality, etc. According to the Directorate of Integration and Diversity's annual report (IMDi 2010b) on the representation of immigrants in Norwegian media, 71% of the newspaper articles published in 2009 took a "problematic" perspective on migration, 18% a resource perspective, and only 11% were considered neutral. In this context, it is not difficult to imagine that the participants, who attempted to negotiate a positive and resourceful image for themselves in the interview, avoided self-identification through a category with negative connotations. IMDi's report also points to

the fact that one third of the articles related to immigrants and integration published in 2009 were related to religion, principally the Islam. If we recall one of the two occurrences for the category *inmigrante* in the corpus is in Susana A, this category was used immediately followed by the category *musulmanes* to introduce background information on the *Muslim* protagonist of the narrative (cf. 4.2.3). This juxtaposition of the categories *inmigrante* and *musulmán* are in line with the findings in IMDi's report, as the topic immigration is often addressed through the problematization of Muslim immigration in the media. In Susana A, Susana took a distant position from the protagonist through the use of pronouns. This stance resonates with Juana's position regarding Latinos as *uncategorizable* in the Norwegian migratory landscape, which triggered the Victor B narrative (cf. 4.1.1) and sustains a "middle" position for Latin Americans in Oslo, as neither *Muslims* nor *Norwegians*.

Whereas the low occurrence rate for *latino*, there are not as clear hypotheses as for immigrant. As previously established, the preferred category label was *extranjero*, a more general category than *latino*, which was often used to generalize the experiences of these particular participants to yield for other migrants (see for example 4.2.1 Juana A). It can be argued that the lack of references to the label *latino* as self-identification in the corpus might be due to a lack of group feeling among the participants. However, the analysis performed in Chapter 4 showed how participants indexed support and solidarity at the interactional level through actively engaging in co-constructing narratives (cf. 4.1.1 Victor B), producing second stories (cf. 4.2.3 Susana A), and orienting the evaluations of the narratives to refer to one another in the use of pronouns (cf. 4.2.4 Juana B), to name a few. Of the remaining five occurrences of *latino* in the interview, three correspond to the moderator. It can be thus argued that the Latino identity was available to all participants and it did not need to be thematized, as not everything relevant to interaction is necessarily indexicalized (Blommaert 2005). More linguistic data from the group with different national compositions is needed in order to answer this question.

Another interesting finding in the analysis of the corpus was that the category labels *noruego* was used twice as often as *extranjero*. These two categories were almost always used to introduce the two antagonist characters in the narrative, the one defined in opposition to the other (see 4.1.1 Victor B, for example). This distribution illustrates the relevance of other categorization to the construction of individual identities in interaction

(Schiffrin 2006), and its importance as a component of group identities through the constitutive praxis of “othering” out-group members (Blommaert 2005). Participants identified themselves most often in opposition to *noruegos* in the narrated universes, who were predominantly identified in terms of communicative proficiency in Norwegian (as in Susana B, Victor C, Juana A, Victor A, and Juana B). Norwegians were the ones that spoke fluently in Norwegian and/or signalled a deviant or non-standard performance in Norwegian by the protagonists of the narratives. However these identifications are dynamic, as shown in the analyses of the contrasting stances that participants continuously took; as in Susana A, in which the narrator aligns herself with the antagonist, or the *noruego*, or in Victor B, where the narrator assigns the category label *noruego*, among others, to himself and introduces different stances regarding the multiple, contesting definitions of Norwegian.

In this sense, the analyses showed how the different uses of categories take different positions and alignments for the narrators in relation to the characters in the story worlds and the other participants in the interview. The participants showed preference for *extranjero* as a self-identification category, which is a broader, less marked category than *inmigrante* and *latino*. Moreover, *extranjero* is a more inclusive category as it can be used to include other groups than mere Latino and functions as a more effective evaluation device in the narratives, as the experiences of the participants are representative for those of all foreigners.

5.2 Ethnic categories?

Most work on categorization and identity construction in narrative this thesis builds upon, operated with the notion of *ethnic categories*. Ethnicity is a difficult concept to define, as it might easily lead to implications of “race” and racism. Discourse analysts ground the notion of ethnicity in the interactional context in which this becomes relevant, as “the basis for inferences about the individual within a very specific social circumstance.” (Banks 1988, quoted by De Fina 2003: 183). In this sense, ethnicity “refers to aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive” (Eriksen 2002: 4, quoted in Lane 2009).

De Fina (2003) uses the notion of *ethnic categories* in the analyses of categorization in the narratives of Mexican immigrants, in which *hispano* and *latino* were among the most

often used terms for self identification. De Fina argues that the relevance of these in her data is related to the saliency of ethnic identifications in American society in general, as a consequence of a particular cultural and social history—from the *melting pot* to the civil rights movement. On the other hand, the narratives analyzed by De Fina often introduce a dimension of racism or discrimination in their complicating events. In these narratives the physical, genetic aspects of ethnic identities are the specific target of aggression, and function as an explanatory factor for the outcome of the narratives. Relaño Pastor (2010) also focuses on *ethnic categories* for dealing with ‘fitting in’ narratives of migrant background students in Madrid schools, as ethnic characteristics referred to cultural, linguistic, and racial categorizations. The targeting of the protagonist’s racial background in the aggressions of the antagonist was also present in the narratives analyzed.

In the previous section 5.1, we saw that the categories *noruego* and *extranjero* were most often used in the narratives. We also established that these categories were defined in linguistic terms in most of the narratives, though we note two examples of categorizations in the lines of religion (cf. 4.2.3, Susana A) and cultural or ethnic background (cf. 4.1.1 Victor B). It is to be determined if these categories can be considered *ethnic categories* in line with the previous research presented here, as none of these narratives introduced a direct account of verbal aggression targeted at the physical aspects of ethnic identities as in De Fina (2003) and Relaño Pastor (2010). Nevertheless, denying that the narratives in the corpus deal with ethnic categorization would mean to operate with a narrow definition of ethnicity as predominately race in the analyses. This perspective is reductionist, as linguistic categorizations intersects with social categories of race and ethnicity, so that “narratives of language experiences among immigrant groups are never exclusively about language, but about experiences of social exclusion” (Relaño Pastor 2010: 89). Consequently, linguistic categorization can often imply ethnic categorization in contexts where monolingualism is the idealized model of national identities (Auer 2005). Hence categorization on ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic grounds intersects, as the dynamic nature of categorization in interaction makes different aspects of the categories relevant to different contexts or narratives (De Fina 2003: Chapter 5).

In the analyses of the narratives presented in Chapter 4, Analysis, we saw that the characters in the story worlds were categorized in relation to their language proficiency in several of the narratives, as in Susana B (cf. 4.1.2), in which Susana is does not obtain a

job because she is a foreigner with low command of Norwegian in a Norwegian environment; Victor C (cf. 4.1.3) in which all Norwegians in the job interview spoke Norwegian but Victor; Juana A (cf. 4.2.1) in which Juana is treated badly because she is a foreigner who does not speak Norwegian; Victor A (cf. 4.2.2) in which Victor is categorized as non-Norwegian and cast suspicion upon because he did not speak Norwegian; and finally Juana B (cf. 4.2.4) where the identifications of the characters are done on the basis of the languages they speak: Norwegian or Swedish. In all of these narratives the most salient aspect of the characters that identifies them as members of a group category are linguistic, as those who speak, speak badly, or do not speak Norwegian.

We can thus conclude by stating that the categorizations presented in the narratives of the corpus are predominantly done on the basis of language proficiency, though very often this linguistic categorization intersects with other relevant social categorizations such as ethnicity (not looking *Norwegian* in Susana A, not looking *Muslim* and being *Latino* in Victor B), religious background (being *Muslim* in Susana A), national background (being *Swedish* in Juana B), etc.

Lane (2009) introduced the notion of *citizenship categories* as a means of assessing the categorization practices of Norwegian governmental institutions, by which *Norwegian* is defined in the terms of a cultural, monolingual, homogenous group. According to Lane, this narrow definition of Norwegianness draws distinctive categories of “us” and “them” in the terms of *Norwegian* and *immigrant*. It is according to these categorization practices that national historical minorities, such as the Kven, have previously been categorized as immigrants because they spoke “foreign” languages though they never crossed any national border. Nowadays, such exclusionary practices of citizenship categorization can define young Norwegians of migrant background as *immigrants*, as it is reflected in the Norwegian Language Council’s definition of Norwegian as equal to *ethnic Norwegian*. Such governmental categorization practices can be reductionist but they are not static, as Lane shows in her analysis of the debate in the media and web that followed the declarations of the Language Council, in which contesting definitions of Norwegianness were created and circulated.

In line with Lane’s findings, the analyses of categorization in the corpus of this project showed that *Norwegian* and *foreigner* (which was preferred over *immigrant*), *noruego*

and *extranjero* were the categories with the most occurrences, and were usually assigned in linguistic terms (cf. 5.1). Thus the notion of “citizenship category” can better reflect the type distinctions or oppositions presented in the data than ethnic categories. There is clearly an ethnic dimension to categorization in the data, but the perspective of linguistic and citizenship categorization can better reflect the tendencies found in the corpus. It should nevertheless be kept in mind that categorizations were not static, as the contrasting identifications and positioning among participants and in the story worlds showed.

5.3 Language conflict narratives?

What is now left to address is the relevance of language as a categorization factor in the story worlds. De Fina and King (2011) analyze “language conflict” narratives as those narratives in which the complicating events portray situations in which the lack of competence in English is used to insult or humiliate the protagonists of the narratives. The most salient characteristic of the *language conflict* narratives is “the categorization ... of antagonists or protagonists (or both) as members of a national, ethnic, or racial group rather than as individuals.” (2011: 168) Thus characters are not mere individuals but function as representatives of the groups to which they were assigned to by categorization; in contrast to *language problem* narratives, in which characters and circumstances are perceived as unique.

The analyses presented in above in Chapter 4, showed that Susana B, Juana A, Victor A and Juana B introduce complicating events that can be defined as language conflict. All of these narratives introduce complex categorizations of the characters in the story worlds and portray situations in which lack of knowledge, or deviant performance in Norwegian is evaluated as the reason for being humiliated, treated badly, or categorized as a *foreigner* and being challenged in claiming access to the same services as a *Norwegian*. De Fina and King’s analysis gives relevance to the micro aspects of language policies by observing the positionings taken by the individuals that are the target of such policies. In the case of our data, the participants position themselves in relation to what researchers have argued is both a liberal and conservative language ideology in Norway (Walton 2006; Lane 2009). There is a liberal ideology with regard to the dialectal variation within Norwegian by promoting tolerance and respect towards regional variants, as well as an aspiration to promote and maintain mutual intelligibility among mainland Scandinavian

languages. While, on the other hand, there is a relatively conservative approach to variation due to contact with *foreign* languages, or languages perceived as foreign due to migration and globalization processes.

[N]orway has seen itself as a monolingual nation. In line with this, there has been a relatively strong tolerance towards variation within the Norwegian language, but less tolerance for heterogeneity outside Norwegian” (Lane 2009: 211)

Juana B (cf. 4.2.4) is an excellent example of this contrast, as the conflicts portrayed point to the coexistence of both a tolerant attitude towards extreme dialectal variation, which can also include the Scandinavian dialectal continuum, as well as a conservative position by which variation due to contact with foreign languages (like Spanish) is evaluated as problematic. Walton (2006) argues in his essay on Norwegian linguistic ideology that as a consequence of the Norwegian language policy that recognizes two standard forms of written Norwegian, Bokmål and Nynorsk, while there is no standard pronunciation for any of the varieties has led to a liberalization in the acceptance of variation.

This has created a situation where to a lesser degree someone «corrects» the language use of a child, and almost never the language use of other adults. This principle has but one exception: foreigners. No one speaks wrong any more, only foreigners.” (p.: 213, the translation is mine)¹¹

Thus, the narratives in the corpus introduce scenarios of conflicting ideologies in Norway, as both conservative and liberal towards variation. The relevance of dominant attitudes towards language as a crucial component in migrants’ formulation of their experiences in Norway is interesting and it becomes evident by applying the notion of language conflict narratives in the analyses. Most Norwegians (82%) identify “good command of Norwegian” as one of the main factors for being a well integrated citizen, followed by “successful integration in the labor market” (IMDi 2010a). The participants’ experiences can then present a micro perspective on the larger, macro social tendencies of migration, integration, and language ideologies in Norway.

5.4 Concluding remarks

This thesis presented a detailed analysis of a corpus of seven narratives of the experiences of three Latin American migrants to Oslo, in which the focus was placed on categorizations as a means of assessing identity construction processes in interaction and

¹¹ "Dette har skapt ein situasjon der ein i liten grad no «rettar» på språket til barn, og så godt som aldri på språket til andre vaksne. Dette prinsippet har eitt unntak: utlendingane. Ingen snakka altså feil lenger, berre utlendingane."

in relation to the socially shared, stereotypical meanings of the categories that allowed these to function as identity construction strategies.

The selection of the participants for the study introduced a different perspective on migration in Norway, as Latin Americans are comparatively a small group that is not often the focus of attention in the migration debate. Moreover, the participants are resourceful migrants, with university level education, are proficient in Norwegian, and have managed to integrate into the labor market in positions relevant to their educational background. They thus offer a contrast to the sometimes overwhelmingly negative image of migration presented in the media and political debates. The methodological approach to data-gathering through a focus group interview provided the possibility of creating an in-group setting for the interview, so that participants' opinions and perspectives came through in the data. The interactional sociolinguistic perspective under which the analyses were performed, allowed us to focus on the micro interactional processes by which identities were negotiated and constructed in the local interactional context among participants, and in relation to the stereotypical meanings assigned to social categories in the narratives. In this sense, the analyses addressed the research questions proposed in Chapter 1, Introduction, which reads as it follows:

- How do participants construct individual identities in interaction through the use of group categories in narratives of personal experience?
 - a) Which categories and category labels do Latin Americans use to refer to themselves and others in narratives of personal experience?
 - b) Which presupposed, shared meanings are assigned to the categories used in the narratives?
 - c) How do participants position themselves in relation to the categorizations presented in the narratives?

With regard to the main research question which functioned rather as a working hypothesis for the thesis, the analyses showed that the participants shared stereotypical representations of categories which they deployed as discourse strategies for stancetaking thus locally constructing individual identities. These identities were rather constant throughout the interview focusing on the opposition between *noruegos* and *extranjeros*,

though we were also able to observe contrasts in the categorizations in different narratives and the repositionings participants took towards the same categories at different moments. In general terms, the analyses showed that participants' identities were emergent in interaction, as the sum of the contrasts and stances taken in relation to the other participants in the interview, including the moderator, and were hence not stable. The stereotypical representations of categories nevertheless remain the same, as shared reductionist representations of social identities, available to speakers as discourse strategies by which individuals' are able to position themselves in relation to and locally construct their identities. Though I do recognize the existence of more stable aspects of individuals identities, as the individual's available linguistic choices (van Dijk 2008), or semiotic potential (Blommaert 2005), this perspective is by no means addressable through the data studied in here as we only count with one interaction for assessing the repertoires of the participants.

Regarding the research question a), the analyses and discussion showed that participants preferred the self-identificatory category *extranjero* "foreigner," over other alternatives. The analysis showed that this category was often used in opposition to *noruego* "Norwegian", which also functioned as a resource for self identification through opposition, or "othering". The categories suggested by the researcher in the formulation of the research questions, *latinos*, and as methodological and theoretical departure point, *inmigrantes* "immigrants", were not used by the participants to refer to themselves. Instead, these categories were ascribed to other characters in the story worlds, or taken distance from through the use of constructed dialogue and evaluations. The hypotheses suggested for understanding this distribution in the use of categories noted that *inmigrante* was a category label with negative connotations which lead participants towards choosing a more neutral term like *extranjero*. There are no solid indications for the reason why the category *latino* was not a preferred self-identification category label, and some tentative answers were proposed. The category Muslim in alternation with immigrant introduced interesting stances, as the other pole of opposition. The participants then, placed themselves in opposition to Norwegians and Muslims at different points in the data and often negotiated a "middle" stance.

When it comes to question b), the presupposed meanings of categories that were observed were of two types: stereotypes and category bound activities. Regarding stereotypes, the

analyses showed how category stereotypes were implicit in the narratives and in many aspects sustained logical relations between the sequences of events, as in the case of Susana A (cf. 4.2.3), where stereotypes of the religious identity of a Moroccan character support the logical connections between the actions as the characters came in conflict regarding the expected dressing codes for Moroccan women. In Victor B (4.1.1), the stereotype of Latino men's temper is at times presupposed in the argumentation, thus assumed as shared by participants in the interaction. Regarding category bound activities, the analyses showed that the identification of Norwegian characters was most often done on the basis of language, thus in the story worlds presented Norwegians spoke Norwegian, and those who spoke Norwegian poorly or not at all, were implicitly categorized as *extranjeros*.

Finally, when considering question c), the analyses showed that participants took contrasting stances in relation to the narratives told and the categorizations introduced. These positionings were quite predictable in some cases, like in the distancing from the category *noruego*, though extremely surprising in other, like in the distancing from the ascription of the category *latino* in favor of *extranjero*. In the last discussion regarding the nature of the categories presented, I suggested that Lane's notion of "citizenship categories" was relevant to our analysis, as it introduced the historical relevance of linguistic and ethnic factors in the formulation of Norwegianness. Ethnic categorization was relevant to the analysis of identity construction in De Fina (2003) and in relation to the macro tendencies in American society in which ethnic identities are a salient component of individual's identities. In the analysis of the corpus I showed that linguistic categorization was a relevant part of the construction of identities in the Norwegian context, and I argued that it was related to the relevance of language as a determining factor for assigning citizenship categories in Norway.

Beyond the observations that were anticipated in the research questions, the analysis showed that the dimension of *language conflict* was a fruitful approach to the analyses of the narratives as it allowed us to address macro contexts referred to in the narratives. In this sense, we have seen how a rather conservative language ideology might be hiding behind Norway's liberal language policing. We have not seen the effects of that ideology, but rather the participants' constructions of it, as well as their positioning in relation to it.

The scope and nature of this project makes the generalization of the observations made in the analysis impossible, since the participants in this project are not representative for Norway's total migrant population, or even Latin American migrants in general; moreover, the focus of analysis was placed on the local context of the interaction. Nevertheless, the participants' formulations of life as a migrant in Oslo do offer an interesting perspective on the micro dimensions of larger transnational processes of migration, the individual realities of migration policies, and the implications and repercussions of language ideology and policies.

Implications of the findings for future research

This thesis has investigated identity work in a rather understudied group of migrants belonging to contemporary Latin American migration to Oslo. The perspective taken was that of a qualitative analysis that showed the participants' perspective on their experiences as migrants. In order to better understand this group, more research is required. It would be interesting for example, to map the composition of the group, and study the different national backgrounds that compose it. This would shed light into whether a Latino identity is preferred over national identifications, and from an interactional perspective on how these identities are negotiated in conversation. The presentation of the statistics for Latin Americans in Norway in 1.1 showed that the largest national group is that of Brazilians, not addressed in the present study which focused on Spanish-speaking Latinos. I have not found any recent studies on contemporary Brazilian immigration to Norway, which might also be interesting to look into due to the rapid growth of the group.

The analyses of the social categorizations made in the narratives, showed how linguistic factors were highly important for the ascription of categories, and this was interpreted in relation to underlying linguistic ideologies circulating in Norway. Many of the narratives analyzed introduced language conflicts in the story worlds in which two conflicting language ideologies were presented: a conservative and a liberal one. The analysis showed this conflict through pointing at contrasting attitudes towards different types of linguistic variation in the story worlds: a liberal one towards regional and Scandinavian variation, and a conservative towards contact induced variation through immigration. Recent studies on receptive multilingualism (Thije and Zeevaert 2007) focus on mutual intelligibility across language borders, such as in the Scandinavian case. The data presented in this thesis introduces a problematizing perspective to receptive

multilingualism in the context of recent migration waves to Europe, which has not been seriously addressed. The ideal of intercomprehension across closely related languages cannot only strengthen contact across borders, but, as demonstrated in the narratives, it can also function as a gate-keeping factor for the integration of migrant population in the majority's society, as functional communicative competence in the host country's language is raised to include receptive comprehension of closely related languages. This field of inquiry deserves further attention, as it introduces tension between the intention of a liberal linguistic ideology and the reality of constructing a new means of "othering" through language.

In this respect, it would also be interesting to trace how different migrant groups in Norway, and not just Oslo, conceive of the relevance of language as a categorization factor in Norway and how they perceive linguistic variation in Norway. Such a study would provide an interesting perspective on Norwegian linguistic ideology, one that complements the debate on the status of Bokmål and Nynorsk standardizations of Norwegian and the dialectal variation represented through them, from a contemporary perspective. Norway has in fact become a multilingual country where variation is not only related to regional dialects and identities, but also to contact with migration languages.

References

- Adelswärd, Viveka (1988), 'Styles of success: on impression management as collaborative action in job interviews', (Institutionen för Tema, Linköpings universitet).
- Ahearn, Laura (2001), 'Language and Agency', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109-37.
- Akinassio, F. Niyi and Ajitotutu, Cheryl Seabrook (1982), 'Performance and ethnic style in job interviews', in John J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Alarcos Llorach, Emilio (1994), *Gramática de la lengua española* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe) 406 s.
- Amossy, Ruth and Pierrot, Anne Herschberg (2001), *Estereotipos y clichés*, trans. Lelia Gándara (Buenos Aires: Eudeba).
- Antaki, Charles and Widdicombe, Sue (1998), 'Identity as an Achievement and as a Tool', in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk* (London: Sage).
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell and Heritage, John (2006), '"Jefferson's transcript notation"', in Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (2 nd. edn.; London: Routledge).
- Auer, Peter (2005), 'A postscript: code-switching and social identity', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37 (3), 403-10.
- Bakhtin, M. M. ([1952-53] 1986), 'The problem of speech genres', in Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (eds.), *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press), 60-102.
- Bamberg, Michael and Georgakopoulou, Alexandra (2008), 'Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis', *Text & Talk*, 28 (3), 377-96.
- Banks, S. (1988), 'Achieving 'unmarkedness' in organizational discourse: A praxis perspective on ethnolinguistic identity', in William B. Gudykunst (ed.), *Language and Ethnic Identity* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters), 15-34.
- Bauman, Richard (2000), 'Language, Identity, Performance', *Pragmatics*, 10 (1), 1-5.
- Baynham, Mike (2006), 'Performing self, family and community in Moroccan narratives of migration and settlement', in Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg (eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Benwell, Bethan and Stokoe, Elizabeth (2006), *Discourse and Identity* (Edinburg: Edinburg University Press).
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994), *The location of culture* (London: Routledge) XIII, 285 s.

- Blommaert, Jan (2005), *Discourse: a critical introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bruner, Jerome (1987), 'Life as Narrative', *Social Research*, 54 (1), 11-32.
- Bucholtz, Mary and Hall, Kira (2005), 'Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach', *Discourse Studies*, 7 (4-5), 585-614.
- Campbell, Sara and Roberts, Celia (2007), 'Migration, ethnicity and competing discourses in the job interview: synthesizing the institutional and personal', *Discourse & Society*, 18 (3), 243-71.
- Carranza, Isolda (1998), 'Low-Narrativity Narratives and Argumentation', *Narrative Inquiry*, 8 (2), 287-317.
- Day, Dennis (1998), 'Being Ascribed, and Resisting, Membership of an Ethnic Group', in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk* (London: Sage).
- De Fina, Anna (2000), 'Orientation in Immigrant Narratives: The Role of Ethnicity in the Identification of Characters', *Discourse Studies*, 2 (2), 131-57.
- (2003), *Identity in narrative: a study of immigrant discourse* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) IX, 251 s.
- (2006), 'Group identity, narrative and self-representations', in Deborah Schiffrin Anna de Fina, and Michael Bamberg (ed.), *Discourse and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 351-75.
- (2008), 'Who tells which story and why? Micro and macro contexts in narrative', *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 28 (3), 421-42.
- De Fina, Anna and King, Kendall A. (2011), 'Language problem or language conflict? Narratives of immigrant women's experiences in the US', *Discourse Studies*, 13 (2), 163-88.
- De Fina, Anna, Schiffrin, Deborah, and Bamberg, Michael (eds.) (2006), *Discourse and Identity* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics, New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Derrida, Jacques (1967), *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Minuit) 445 s.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1997), *Linguistic anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) XXI, 398 s.
- Erickson, Frederick (2004), *Talk and Social Theory: ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2002), *Ethnicity and nationalism* (London: Pluto Press) X, 199 s.
- Foucault, Michel (1969), *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris: Gallimard) 275 s.

- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra (2007), 'Thinking Big with Small Stories in Narrative and Identity Analysis', in Michael Bamberg (ed.), *Narrative - State of the Art* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company), 145-54.
- Grice, Paul (1975), 'Logic and conversation', in P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (3 Speech Acts; New York: Academic Press), 41-58.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982), *Discourse strategies* (New York: Cambridge University Press) XII, 225 s.
- Gutierrez Böhmer, Sofía and Mazzocchi, Laura (forthcoming), 'La caracterización de tiempos verbales en las narrativas de experiencia personal: el caso del imperfecto perfecto', *Primeras Jornadas de Jóvenes Lingüistas* (Buenos Aires).
- Günthner, Susanne (1999), 'Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 685-708.
- Holmes, Janet (2006), 'Workplace narratives, professional identity and relational practice', in Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg (eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 166-87.
- Hutchby, Ian and Wooffitt, Robin (2008), *Conversation analysis: principles, practices and applications* (2 nd. edn.; Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Hymes, Dell (1996), *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: toward an understanding of voice* (London: Taylor & Francis) XIII, 258 s.
- IMDi (2010a), 'Integreringsbarometeret 2009: om befolkningens holdninger til innvandring, integrering og mangfold', *IMDI rapport* (4/2010; Oslo: integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet), 115 s.
- (ed.), (2010b), *Medieskapt islamfrykt og usynlig hverdagsliv: innvandrere i norske medier : årsrapport 2009* (IMDI rapport, 1-2010; Oslo: Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet) 128 s.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (2009), 'Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance', in Alexandra Jaffe (ed.), *Stance. Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (New York: Oxford University Press), 3-28.
- Johannesson, Kurt (1998), *Retorik: eller konsten att övertyga* (Stockholm: Norstedt) 288 s.
- Johnstone, Barbara (2000), *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Joseph, John E. (2004), *Language and identity: national, ethnic, religious* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) XII, 268 s.
- King, Kendall A. and De Fina, Anna (2010), 'Language Policy and Latina immigrants: An Analysis of Personal Experience and Identity in Interview Talk', *Applied Linguistics*, 31 (5), 651-70.

- Kjelsvik, Bjørghild (2008), 'Emergent speech genres of teaching and learning interaction. Communities of practice in Cameroonian schools and villages.', (University of Oslo).
- Koike, Dale A. (1996), 'Functions of the adverbial *ya* in Spanish narrative discourse', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25 (2), 267-79.
- Krueger, Richard A. and Casey, Mary Anne (2009), *Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research* (Los Angeles: Sage) XVIII, 219 s.
- Labov, William (1966), *The social stratification of English in New York City* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics) XII, 655 s.
- (1972a), *Sociolinguistic patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press) XVIII, 344 s.
- (1972b), 'The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax', in William Labov (ed.), *Language in the Inner City. studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- (2010), 'Where should I begin?', in Deborah Schiffrin, Anna De Fina, and Anastasia Nylund (eds.), *Telling Stories: Language, Narrative, and Social Life* (Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press).
- Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua ([1967] 1997), 'Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7 (1-4), 3-38.
- Lakoff, George (1987), *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Lane, Pia (2009), 'Mediating national language management: the discourse of citizenship categorization in Norwegian media', *Language Policy*, 8, 209-25.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2008), *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Lanza, Elizabeth (2008), '"Selecting individuals, groups and sites"', in Li Wei and M Moyer (eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Lanza, Elizabeth and Svendsen, Bente Ailin (2007), 'Tell me who your friends are and I might be able to tell you what language(s) you speak: Social network analysis, multilingualism, and identity', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11 (3), 275-300.
- Liebig, Thomas (2009), 'Jobs for immigrants: Labour Market Integration in Norway', in OECD (ed.), *Jobs for Immigrants* (Paris: OECD), 84.
- Lindholm Narváez, Elena (2008), '"Ese terrible espejo": autorrepresentación en la narrativa sobre el exilio del Cono Sur en Suecia', (Umeå universitet, Institutionen för språkstudier).

- Lundström, Catrin (2007), *Svenska latinas. Ras, klass og kön i svenskhetens geografi* (Gothenburg: Makadam).
- Mishler, Elliot (2006), 'Narrative and Identity: the double arrow of time', in Deborah Schiffrin Anna De Fina, and Michael Bamberg (ed.), *Discourse and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 30-47.
- Mæhlum, Brit (2008), 'Språk og identitet', in Brit Mæhlum, et al. (eds.), *Språkmøte. Innføring i Sosiolingvistik* (2 nd. edn.; Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk forlag).
- Ochs, Elinor and Capps, Lisa (2001), *Living Narrative. Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Patterson, Wendy (2008), 'Narrative of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and its Limitations', in M. et al Andrews (ed.), *Doing Narrative Research* (Los Angeles: Sage).
- Pujolar, J. (2007), 'Bilingualism and the nation-state in the post national era', in Monica Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan), 71-95.
- Relaño Pastor, Ana María (2010), 'Ethnic categorization and moral agency in 'fitting in' narratives among Madrid immigrant students', *Narrative Inquiry*, 20 (1), 85-105.
- Relaño Pastor, Ana María and De Fina, Anna (2005), 'Contesting Social Place: Narratives of Language Conflict', in Mike Baynham and Anna De Fina (eds.), *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing).
- Robson, Colin (2002), *Real World Research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Sacks, Harvey (1992), *Lectures on Conversation*, ed. Gail Jefferson, 2 vols. (1; Cambridge: Blackwell).
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007), 'A tutorial on membership categorization', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39 (3), 462-82.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1981), 'Tense Variation in Narrative', *Language*, 57 (1), 45-62.
- (1994), *Approaches to Discourse* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- (1996), 'Narrative as self portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity', *Language in Society*, 25 (2), 167-203.
- (2006), 'From linguistic reference to social reality', in Deborah Schiffrin Anna De Fina, and Michael Bamberg (ed.), *Discourse and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Silva-Corvalan, Carmen (1983), 'Tense and Aspect in Oral Spanish Narrative: Context and Meaning', *Language*, 59 (4), 760-80.

- SSB (2010), *Innvandring og innvandrere 2010*, ed. Statistisk sentralbyrå (Statistiske analyser, 2010:2; Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå) 187.
- (2011), 'Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents. 1 January 2011. Many new European immigrants', *Population* (updated 04.28.2011) <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/01/10/innvbef_en/>, accessed 05.13.2011.
- (2011), 'Population statistics. Immigration and emigration, 2010. Highest immigration ever in 2010.', (updated 05.05.2011) <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/02/20/innvutv_en/>, accessed 05.13.2011.
- (2011), 'Focus on: Immigration and Immigrants', *National overviews* (updated 01.01.2011) <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/00/10/innvandring_en/>, accessed 05.13.2011.
- (2011), 'Registered unemployment among immigrants, 1st quarter 2011. Immigrant unemployment slightly down', *Unemployment* (updated 05.11.2011) <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/06/03/innvarbl_en/>, accessed 05.13.2011.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth (2003), 'Doing gender, doing categorisation: Recent developments in language and gender research', *International Sociolinguistics*, 2 (1).
- Tajfel, H. (1981), *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Talmy, Steven (2011), 'The Interview as Collaborative Achievement: Interaction, Identity, and Ideology in a Speech Event', *Applied Linguistics*, 32 (1), 25-42.
- Tannen, Deborah (2007), *Talking voices. Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2 nd. edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Thije, Jan D. ten and Zeevaert, Ludger (eds.) (2007), *Receptive multilingualism: linguistic analyses, language policies, and didactic concepts* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) X, 328 s.
- Tronstad, Kristian Rose (2010), 'Mangfold og likestilling i arbeidslivet. Holdninger og erfaringer blant arbeidsgivere og tillitsvalgte', *Fafo-report* (39: Fafo), 92.
- UDI, Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (2011), 'Requirements to obtain Norwegian citizenship by application', (updated 09.07.2010) <<http://www.udi.no/Norwegian-Directorate-of-Immigration/Central-topics/Citizenship-Requirements-to-obtain-Norwegian-citizenship-by-application/>>, accessed 05.19.2011.
- (2011), 'Requirements for financial support and housing', (updated 12.29.2009) <<http://www.udi.no/Norwegian-Directorate-of-Immigration/Central-topics/Family-immigration/Requirements-of-the-citizenship-permit-held-by-the-person-in-Norway-the-sponsor/Subsistence-and-housing-requirement/>>, accessed 05.19.2011.
- UNDP, United Nations Development Program (2010), 'Human Development Report 2010. 20 th Anniversary Edition', (New York: United Nations Development Program).

- van Dijk, Teun A. (1984), *Prejudice in discourse: an analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation* (Amsterdam: Benjamins) x, 170 s.
- (1993), 'Stories and racism', in Dennis K. Mumby (ed.), *Narrative and Social Control* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage), 121-42.
- (1995), 'Discourse analysis and ideology analysis', in C. Schäffner and A. Wenden (eds.), *Language and Peace* (Aldershot: Dartmouth), 17-33.
- (1998), *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach* (London: SAGE) X, 374 s.
- (2008), *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (2009), *Society and discourse: how social contexts influence text and talk* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) X, 287 s.
- Walton, Stephen (2006), 'Språkleg normalitet', in Thomas Hylland Eriksen and Jan-Kåre Breivik (eds.), *Normalitet* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget), 203–25.

Appendix A

Transcript conventions used

(1.10)	silence in seconds and tenths of seconds for pauses longer than half a second
(.)	pause shorter than half a second
=	latching turns
.	falling intonation
,	rising intonation (question, pause)
hyph-	unfinished contours or unfinished words
V:	: long pronunciation
<u>underlined</u>	emphasis
<i>italic</i>	words or phrases in Norwegian
“quotation marks”	constructed dialogue
> <	part of an utterance is delivered at a quicker pace than the rest
◦	more quiet (less volume)
@	laughter
00.00.00	time of initiation of the turn/narrative in hour, minute and seconds
(commentary)	notes on gestures, noises, etc., and disambiguation and sentence completion in the English translation
*	postalveolar implosive click [!] used expressively
I mean / you know	discourse markers written in one word.
xxx	unclear speech
CAPITAL LETTERS	replacing information to make participants anonymous

The narratives are presented in the same sequential order as they were elicited in the interview.

The names of the participants are abbreviated to their initials: **V**: Victor; **J**: Juana; **S**: Susana; **M**: Moderator

Juana A

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 01 | M | (00.08.22) y qué: cuál- cuál fue la experiencia más fuerte que recordás de de ése primer tiempo, | 01 | M | (00.08.22) and what- what- what was the strongest experience that you remember from that time, |
| 02 | | así de: una cosa en- en concreto | 02 | | like: one concrete experience |
| 03 | J | yo creo el la primera vez que- que: | 03 | J | I think the first time that- that |
| 04 | | para <u>mí</u> fue el: sentir el <u>racismo</u> por primera vez, e: | 04 | | for me it was the first time I experienced racism for the first time, e: |
| 05 | | osea me-nunca lo había sentido en México no, [donde eres] uno más que nad- | 05 | | I mean m-I had never felt that in Mexico, right,[where you're] one like the rest that noth- |
| 06 | M | [qué qué:] = | 06 | M | [what what]= |
| 07 | | =[qué pasó, te acordás] de alguna situación,= | 07 | | =[what happened, do you remember] some situation,= |
| 08 | J | [No, simplemente: e:] | 08 | J | [no, just e:] |
| 09 | | =Sí p- ir a un <i>Narvesen</i> @ | 09 | | =yes w- to go to a Narvesen @ |
| 10 | | a una tienda y que alguien te trate mal porque: | 10 | | to a shop and that someone treat you badly because |
| 11 | | >porque eres extranjero< | 11 | | >because you are a foreigner< |
| 12 | | >porque no puedes hablar< (1) | 12 | | >because you can't speak< (1) |
| 13 | | e: eso fue a lo que: °bueno- (1.1) | 13 | | it was that- °well- (1.1) |
| 14 | | fue un- una persona que- (0.8) que sí se porto bastante mal no, [xxx] | 14 | | it was a- a person that- (0.8) that behaved quite badly right, [xxx] |
| 15 | M | pero [qué-] qué te dijo o qué cómo fue, | 15 | M | but [what-] what did he say or how was it, |
| 16 | J | e- pues simplemente intentas hablar en noruego. | 16 | J | well you just try to speak in Norwegian. |
| 17 | | te <u>corri:gen</u> , no | 17 | | they <u>corre:ct</u> you, right, |
| 18 | | se <u>rí:en</u> , e- bueno. | 18 | | they <u>lau:gh</u> , e- well. |
| 19 | | era una persona que trabajaba en un <i>Narvesen</i> que estaba junto al <i>voksenopplæringscenter</i> | 19 | | he/she was a person who worked at a <i>Narvesen</i> (kiosk) that was besides the <i>voksenopplæringscenter</i> |
| 20 | | y estaba: o sea | 20 | | and she/he was I mean |
| 21 | | a pesar de que constantemente llegaban extranjeros | 21 | | in spite of foreigners constantly arriving (to the shop) |
| 22 | | pus no era una persona que era muy <u>feliz</u> @ en su trabajo, | 22 | | well he/she wasn't a person who was very happy @ with her/his job, |
| 23 | | y: se aprovechaba un poco de: la situación (0.8) de: | 23 | | and he/she would take advantage of the situation (0.8) of: |
| 24 | V | y se desquitaba con los extranjeros @ | 24 | V | and he would take it out on the foreigners @ |
| 25 | J | y se- y se desquitaba con nosotros | 25 | J | and- and she/he would take out on us |
| 26 | | no no fui la primera ni la última no, a la que le pasó esto pero: | 26 | | I wasn't the first nor the last one right, to whom that happened but |
| 27 | | pero fue la primera vez que me di cuenta que- (0.8) que: (.) | 27 | | but it was the first time that I realized that- (0.8) that (.) |
| 28 | | osea que sentí en: pus en carne propia lo que es que la gente te trate <u>diferente</u> | 28 | | I mean that I felt it on: well on my own skin what it is that people treat you differently |
| 29 | | o que te trate mal por por como te ves o por- como hablas (I:mhm) no, | 29 | | or badly because of the way you look or how you talk (I:mhm) right, |
| 30 | | que es algo que no no me había tocado vivir en: (.) pues nunca antes en mi vida (2.14) | 30 | | it is something that I hadn't experienced in: (.) well never before in my life (2.14) |
| 31 | | tal vez no es gran cosa ahorita pero en ese momento: me- fue cuando caí- me cayó en cuenta no, que que: | 31 | | maybe that's not a big deal now but in that moment m- it was when I realized right, that that: |
| 32 | | que era alguien diferente en este país. no, | 32 | | that I was someone different in this country right, |

33 de de haber- de ser alguien igual a
todos los demás en en el mío. no,

33 from being someone like everybody else in
in my own (country) right,

Victor A:

01	V	(00.17.16) mío fue en (.) SCHOOL (1.9)	01	V	(00.17.16) mine was at (.) SCHOOL (1.9)
02		y >ahí andaba< yo lo pasé bien. @	02		and >there I was< I had a good time @
03		yo lo único que quería era aprender noruego así es que:- (.)	03		the one thing I wanted was to learn Norwegian so:- (.)
04		sí era: no entendía nada pero: (0.9)	04		yeah it wa:s I didn't understand a thing (0.9) bu:t
05		pero como al fin ya tenía el curso,	05		but like I finally had a class,
06		y tenía que aprender, y: (1)	06		and I had to learn, a:nd
07		volver a aprenderlo. >volver a aprenderlo.< @	07		to learn it again. >to learn it again.< @
08		y: (1.3) °bien fue (.)	08		a:nd (1.3) °well it was (.)
09		iba rá:pido el curso que me metieron fue uno que era s- sumamente como <u>avanzado</u>	09		it went fast the class I was placed in it was one that was e- extremely <u>advanced</u>
10		y era para la gente que: (1)	10		and it was meant for people who: (1)
11		que podía-	11		that could
12		nos hacían un examen (M: mhm) primero para ver como calificarnos,	12		they tested us (M: mhm) first to see how to place us,
13		y yo había calificado bien pero no me acordaba de nada del idioma (.)	13		and I had qualified well but I didn't remember any of the language (.)
14		yo lo sabía de niño - (2.09)	14		I knew it as a child - (2.09)
15		y bien. (0.7)	15		and well. (0.7)
16		fue súper rápido y	16		It went really fast
17		luego de do: dos meses o tres yam (1)	17		after two: or three month I da- (1)
18		me: me tuve que poner a trabajar. (1.4)	18		I ha: had to start working. (1.4)
19		estaba obligado a trabaja:r,	19		I was obliged to wo:rk,
20		tenía que trabaja:r ,	20		I had to wo:rk,
21		me había casado con: Violeta, y (1)	21		I had gotten married to Violeta, a:nd (1)
22		necesitaba demostrar que tenía <i>inte:cto</i>	22		I needed to show that I had <i>i:ntekt</i> (income)
23		y que era un noruego:, (0.8) como todo el resto. @	23		and that I was a Norwegian:, (0.8) like everyone else. @
24		y eso fue difícil. (0.8) (mhm)	24		and that was hard. (0.8) (mhm)
25		yo creo que ése fue el el- (1) como el:	25		I think that was the- (1) like the:
26		el choque más grande fue ése ser- e	26		the biggest shock was that of being- e
27		o sea tener papeles de norue:go	27		I mean having Norwegian papers
28		ser no- como como digo así como <u>técnicamente</u> ser noruego	28		to be No- like like I say like to be <u>technically</u> Norwegian
29		pero en la realidad ser: (.) chileno. (.)	29		but actually be: (.) Chilean (.)
30		ser un extranjero.	30		to be a foreigner
31		siempre cuando iba a hacer papeles al- (0.7) a la policí:a,	31		always when I 'd go to fix my papers to- (0.7) to the police
32		cuando iba a cambiar mi	32		when I 'd go to change my:
33		cuando ya tratar de sacar el permiso de conducir, cuando (1.5)	33		then I'd try to get a driver's licence whe:n (1.5)
34		cuando iba a cualquier lado yo en realidad no era nunca era un noruego	34		wherever I went I was never actually I was not a Norwegian
35		a pesar de que yo mostraba mi pasapo:rte,	35		in spite of showing my pa:ssport,
36		a pesar de que...	36		in spite of...
37	M	pero te acuerdas no sé la primera vez que fuiste a la policía	37	M	but do you remember I don't know the first time you went to the police
38		[ponte que]...	38		[figure that]
39	V	[sí sí] sí decían	39	V	[yes yes] yes they would say
40		bueno	40		well

41	yo iba con: -	41	I 'd go wi:th -
42	como no sabía: noruego,	42	since I didn't speak Norwegian,
43	entonces me acompañaba mi- mi papá	43	then my- my dad would come with me
	y: (1.7)		a:nd (1.7)
44	entonces mi papá era el que el que de	44	then my dad was the one who in one way
	cierta manera: (1.2)		or ano:ther (1.2)
45	el <u>hablaba</u> por mí me entiendes, cuando	45	he would <u>speak</u> for me you know, when I
	yo hacía los trámites (.) y:		was presenting my papers (.) a:nd
46	y la policía le decía que “no	46	and the police would say that “no
47	que quería que yo le hablara,	47	that he/she wanted me to speak,
48	porque si yo era un noruego entonces	48	because if I was a Norwegian then that I
	que yo le hablara noruego. (0.6)		should speak in Norwegian to her. (0.6)
49	que por qué estaba hablando él por mí”	49	that why was he (my dad) speaking for
	(1.31)		me” (1.31)
50	entonces él le explicaba que “yo había	50	then he would explain to her that “I had
	estado afuera		been abroad
51	que no me acordaba el idioma”	51	that I didn't remember the language”
52	“entonces que no era noruego.” (2.95)	52	“then that I wasn't a Norwegian.” (she
			said) (2.95)
53	M porque no podías hablar =	53	M because you couldn't speak=
54	V =no porque no sabi- no sabía hablar en	54	V =because I cou- I couldn't speak
	noruego asique no era noruego yo (.)		Norwegian then I wasn't a Norwegian I (.)
55	yo no era noruego, osea en- (2.36)	55	I wasn't a Norwegian, I mean en-(2.36)
56	M eso fue fue una persona en concreto que	56	M that was was a concrete person who told
	te dijo eso=		you that=
57	V =policía en la <i>udi</i>	57	V =police (woman) at <i>udi</i> (acronym for
			immigration authority)
58	cuando fui a sacar el- cuando fui a pedir	58	when I went to get the- when I went to
	los papeles para (1.56) para el ob- opps-		ask for the papers to (1.56) for
	<i>oppholdstillatelse</i> de la Violeta		(presenting) the opps- <i>oppholdstillatelse</i>
			(residence permit) for Violeta
59	°sí no fue	59	°yeah it was
60	fui a pedir ese papel ese certificado	60	I went to ask for that paper that certificate
61	M y qué d- te dijo directamente así	61	M and what d- did she say to you straight
			forward:
62	“no entonces tú- entonces no es	62	“no then you- then he is not
	noruego” @		Norwegian”@
63	V no quizás- no sé si no me dijo es- osea	63	V no maybe- I don't know if she told- I
			mean
64	m- me dijo entonces como	64	she told me then something like:
65	“qué tipo de noruego es”	65	“then what kind of a Norwegian is he,”
66	osea como (.) qué (1)	66	I mean like (.) what (1)
67	“qué me estás hablando o sea si no sabe	67	“what are you talking about if he doesn't
	hablar noruego” (4.27)		even speak Norwegian-” (4.27)
68	S sí es que yo creo que- no sé cómo es el	68	S yeah I think that- I don't know how the
	proceso este		process is
69	pero si tú vas a pedir el <u>pasapo:rte</u>	69	but if you apply for a <u>Norwegian</u> passport
	noruego para ser <u>noruego</u> ,		to become <u>Norwegian</u>
70	tienes que demostrar que sabes <u>noruego</u> ,	70	you have to prove that you speak
			<u>Norwegian</u> .
71	y que has ido al <u>curso</u> tantas horas si es	71	and that you took a <u>course</u> that lasted so
	que		many hours
72	entonces de repente entonces por eso	72	then maybe that's why he/she thought,
	pensó, o sea “cómo,		I mean “how,
73	entonces puede ser noruego si es que no	73	then he can't be Norwegian if you don't
	sabes noruego [si es que no has] =		speak Norwegian [if you havn't]=
74	V [claro]	74	V: [sure]
75	S =ido al curso si es que no has	75	S = been to the course if you haven't

		demonstrado que puedes”=			demonstrated that you can”=
76	V	=que yo nas- nació acá	76	V	=I was born here
77		entonces era como empezar a explicarle toda mi vida[para que osea]	77		then it was like I had to tell him/her my life story [so that I mean]
78	S	[mhm claro]	78	S	[mhm claro]
79		eso es una cosa que aca es impresionante. osea	79		that's something quite amazing here. I mean
80		como que no no se pueden explicar que hayan personas que: (1.4)	80		that they can't understand that there might be people that (1.4)
81		tú tienes que <u>siempre</u> dar la explicación de qué es lo que eres, de qué -	81		you <u>always</u> have to explain what it is that you are, what -
82		de por qué hablas <u>mal</u> de por qué hablas bien	82		why you speak so <u>badly</u> why you speak so well
83		si hablas bien también te preguntan “por qué hablas tan bien,”	83		if you speak well they also ask you “why do you speak so well”
84	S	“por qué hablas xxx”	84	S	why do you speak xxx
85	V	sí @@ es que <u>siempre</u> hay algo ah,	85	V	yes @@ there's <u>always</u> something right,
86		o te pareces <u>mucho</u> a nosotros o te pareces <u>muy poco</u> ,	86		you are either <u>a lot</u> like us or <u>very little</u> ,
87		pero siempre enco- em en relación a ellos (1.1)	87		but always in relation to them (1.1)
88		ob- o para bien o para mal. (0.6) meentiendes (J: mhm)	88		for better or worse. (0.6) you know (J: mhm)
89		y así es todo el rato es siempre eso como:	89		and it's like that all the time like
90		“o eres <i>flink</i> , o eres: o eres malo.	90		"you are either <i>flink</i> (clever) or bad
91		o eres bueno, o eres tonto.	91		you're good or dumb
92		o eres feo, o eres lindo.	92		you're ugly or good looking
93		o eres a: alegre, o eres muy callado.	93		you're happy or too quiet
94		eres raro, o eres -”	94		you're weird or -"
95		siempre es como en comparación con algo	95		always in comparison to something
96		con algo que que ellos consideran que es <u>normal</u> (S-M-J:mhm)	96		to something they consider that is <u>normal</u> (S-M-J: mhm)
97		una normalidad creo yo (1.3)	97		a normality I think (1.3)
98		asique así era y (.)	98		so that's how it was a:nd (.)
99		tener como todo el rato que: demostrar que uno es de verdad que @	99		having like to prove all the time that to prove that one is for real that @
100		[no sé]@	100		[I don't know]
101	S	[sí]	101	S	[yes]

Susana A

102	S	(00.21.30) no es que yo también creo que los noruegos osea (1.1)	102	S	(00.21.30) no is that I also believe that Norwegians I mean (1.1)
103		a parte que viven en una burbuja, (0.7)	103		besides the fact that they live in a bubble, (0.7)
104		se creen el centro del mundo, (V:@) no,	104		they believe that they are the center of the universe, (V:@) right,
105		los mejores no, osea (2.14) (comiendo)	105		the best ones right, I mean (2.14) (eating)
106		y como tu dices osea	106		and like you say I mean
107		en mi trabajo hay muchos este: inmigrantes de diferentes culturas (1.3)	107		at my work there are a lot of eh: immigrants from different cultures (1.3)
108		y muchos musulmanes	108		and a lot of Muslims
109		y entonces uno de ellos le dijo a la otra a una musulmana que había llevado una <u>revista</u>	109		and then one of them told the other one to a Muslim woman that had brought with her a <u>magazine</u>
110		°de dónde de: dónde de Marruecos creo	110		°from where from where from Morocco I

	(1.4)		think (1.4)
111	y dijo- y vio las fotos	111	and said- and she saw the pictures
112	y dijo “ah pero allá en Marruecos también se visten <u>normales</u> entonces.” (V-M: @)	112	and said “oh but over there in Morocco you also dress <u>normal</u> then.” (V-M: @)
113	y yo cómo “qué- cómo le va a decir eso” osea	113	and I how “what- how can you say that to her” I mean
114	entonces la otra “sí no es que no todos somos <u>anormales</u> pues” le dijo osea @@	114	I mean then the other one “yeah no the thing is that not all of us are <u>abnormal</u> ” then she told her I mean @ @
115	me entiendes, osea para ellos la comparación de osea se ponen <u>jeans</u> y pantalones las mujeres también allá osea	115	you know, I mean to them the comparison between I mean they wear <u>jeans</u> and pants women over there too I mean
116	no todas andan con los con los ve:los y los vestidos no, pero- (1.3)	116	not everyone goes around with the ve:ils and dresses right, but- (1.3)
117	osea hay que tener mucho <u>tacto</u> (J- V:mhm) mucho cuidado de lo que lo que uno dice osea “normal”	117	I mean you have to have a lot of <u>tact</u> (J- V:mhm) to be careful with what what one says I mean “normal”
118	igual para ellos nosotros podemos ser anormales porque no: (0.7)	118	likewise to them we can be abnormal because we do: n't (0.7)
119	porque usamos <u>jeans</u> y y: verdad, o sea	119	because we wear <u>jeans</u> and a:nd right, I mean

Victor B:

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 01 | M | (00.37.41) cómo cómo creen que los noruegos los ven a ustedes, (.) o sea cómo: | 01 | M | (00.37.41) how how do you think Norwegians see you, (.) I mean ho:w |
| 02 | | nosé si piensa como <u>inmigrante</u> o como <u>latino</u> o: como peruano mexicano chileno que - | 02 | | I dunno if one thinks like <u>immigrant</u> or like <u>Latino</u> or like Peruvian Mexican Chilean what |
| 03 | | no sé qué qué qué creen ustedes que ellos ven en en ustedes, | 03 | | I dunno what what what do you think that they see in you, |
| 04 | | ahí de una manera superficial no, | 04 | | like in a superficial manner right, |
| 05 | J | yo la verdad em- muchas veces me pregunto eso | 05 | J | I actually e- wonder about this often |
| 06 | | porque como no caemos en la categoría de los musulmanes, (S: <u>mhm</u>) | 06 | | because since we do not fall in the category of Muslims, (S: <u>mhm</u>) |
| 07 | | >no te ves musulmán.< | 07 | | >you don't look Muslim.< |
| 08 | | pero tampoco te ves noruego, y: | 08 | | but you don't look like a Norwegian either, a:nd |
| 09 | | y no te ve- osea te escuchan y es español | 09 | | and they see- I mean they hear you and it's Spanish |
| 10 | | y entonces eh- como que le tienen un poco más de [respeto] al español | 10 | | and then e- like they have a bit more [respect] for Spanish |
| 11 | S | [sí] | 11 | S | yes |
| 12 | J | porque (.) finalmente es un idioma:= | 12 | J | because (.) it is actually a language: = |
| 13 | S | =que les gusta a ellos= | 13 | S | =which they like= |
| 14 | J | =europeo o medio muy popular | 14 | J | =a European language or kind of popular |
| 15 | | entonces como que no saben en donde ponerte | 15 | | then like they don't know where to place you |
| 16 | | en qué categoría ponerte, no, | 16 | | in which category to place you, right, |
| 17 | | eh: entonces es como - (1.8) | 17 | | eh: then it's li:ke - (1.8) |
| 18 | | n:o sé no - | 18 | | I dunno: no - |
| 19 | | yo <u>quisiera</u> saber qué qué es lo que piensan pero: a mí no m- n... | 19 | | I would like to know what it is that they think bu:t to me no |
| 20 | | digo fuera de esas pocas experiencias @ con gente no tan agradable @ | 20 | | I mean besides those few experiences @ with less than pleasant people @ |
| 21 | | pues n- no sé no, en que c- no sé qué es lo que piensan. (0.6) °realmente (0.9) | 21 | | well I don- don't know what they think (0.6) actually (0.9) |
| 22 | | porque no: me pueden poner en una categoría (M: <u>mhm</u>) de las que tienen esas preestablecidas (S: <u>mhm</u>) | 22 | | because they can't place me into a preestablished category (M: <u>mhm</u>) that they have (S: <u>mhm</u>) |
| 23 | | que si o estás dentro o estás fuera, | 23 | | in which you're either in or out of it, |
| 24 | | y como no estás en ninguna de las dos | 24 | | and since you are in neither of those |
| 25 | | entonces (.) eres algo pues un poco <u>exó:tico</u> : [y:] | 25 | | then (.) you are something rather <u>exo:tici</u> [a:nd] |
| 26 | S | [sí] | 26 | S | [yes] |
| 27 | V | yo creo que eso ahí yo creo que por ahí va porque [osea en el]= | 27 | V | I think that's in the direction (that the answer lays) because [I mean in the]= |
| 28 | S | [sí] | 28 | S | [yes] |
| 29 | V | =en el cas- en los casos ma:s <u>bizarros</u> o sea (.) el tipo que siempre: (.) <u>caricaturiza</u> : a la persona que está conociendo, entonces no sé si: s- (1.2) | 29 | V | =in the most <u>bizarre</u> cases I mean (.) the guy always makes a <u>caricaturization</u> of the person he is getting to know, then I don't know if (1.2) |
| 30 | | si ve un <u>argentino</u> , tiene que ser como <u>Maradona</u> | 30 | | if he sees an <u>Argentine</u> , he has to be like <u>Maradona</u> (football player) |
| 31 | | o tiene que ser un <u>gaucho</u> . meentiendes, | 31 | | or has to be like a <u>gaucho</u> (cowboy). you know, |
| 32 | | si ve un <u>mexicano</u> , tiene que ser [un <u>charro</u> .] meentiendes, (S: <u>mhm</u>) | 32 | | if he sees a Mexican, he has to be [a <u>charro</u>] youknow, (S: <u>mhm</u>) |
| 33 | J | [xxx sombrero sí] | 33 | J | [xxx sombrero] |
| 34 | V | y es como un poco eso es como | 34 | V | and is like |

35		“ah pero tú no eres pero ere:s mexicano pero no no -	35		“oh but you are a Mexican but you don’t don’t -
36	S	°si no pero=	36	S	°yes but=
37	V	= noeres un charro no andas con pistolo:nes” nosé una cosa =	37	V	=you are not a charro with big pistols” I mean a thing=
38	M	= qué recuerdas que te hayan dicho [algo] como:	38	M	= do you remember someone telling you [something] li:ke
39	V	[sí]	39	V	[yes]
40		sí me lo [dijeron. en una entrevista de traba:jo]	40		yes they [told me at a job interview]
41	S	[no pero <u>es cierto</u> . “pero tú no tienes] plumas”= @@	41	S	[no but that’s <u>true</u> . “but you don’t wear] feathers (on your forehead)= @@
42	M	=que pero qué qué te qué te acuerdas de algo: =	42	M	=but what what what do you remember something
43	V	=sí [me dijeron]	43	V	=yes [they told me]
44	M	una situación en concreto,	44	M	one concrete situation
45	V	(00:39:36) sí me dijero:n (1.1)	45	V	(00:39:36) yes I remember I was told (1.1)
46		me acuerdo en una entrevista de trabajo, en la que ya era: era la <u>última</u> entrevista	46		I remember in a job interview, that wa:s was the <u>last</u> interview
47		y habíamos dos pers-	47		and we were two peop-
48		quedábamos solo yo y otr- y un noruego, (.)	48		there was only me and anoth- and a Norwegian left, (.)
49		para conseguir el trabajo y (0.8)	49		for getting the job and (0.8)
50		y en esa ocasión me tocó hablar con (.) con el dueño: (1.35)	50		and on that occasion I had to talk to the owner (1.35)
51		con el socio <u>económico</u> osea el <u>capitalista</u> de la empresa,	51		to the <u>financial</u> partner I mean the <u>investor</u> of the company
52		el que era el <u>dueño</u> de la empresa, (1.5) y:	52		the one who was the <u>owner</u> of the company, (1.5) a:nd
53		y él estaba super preocupado de que yo entrara. @@	53		and he was really worried that I might get the job. @@
54		me di cuenta meentiendes,	54		I realized youknow,
55		osea era una empresa en la que no había <u>ningún</u> extranjero	55		I mean it was a company where there weren’t <u>any</u> foreigners
56		yo habría sido el primero (.)	56		I would have been the first one (.)
57		y él estaba muy preocupado.(.)	57		and he was really worried. (.)
58		estaba sobre todo como que e: (2.5)	58		he was specially like e: (2.5)
59		a él le preocupaba,	59		he was worried,
60		osea el estaba realmente <u>miedoso</u> de mi: de mi condición de extranjero.	60		I mean he was really <u>scared</u> of my: of me being a foreigner.
61		de que “de que yo podría tener otras <u>costu:mbres</u> ,	61		that “that I might have other <u>cu:stoms</u> ,
62		de que yo podía ser <u>violento</u> ,	62		that I could be <u>vi:olent</u> ,
63		de que yo podía- (.) cómo era mi temperamento,	63		that I could- (.)how was my temper,
64		qué qué ea- ”	64		what what wea”
65		o sea el tipo estaba <u>tratando</u> en ese momento de la entrevista de trabajo,	65		I mean the guy was <u>trying</u> at that moment of the job interview,
66		tratando de entender qué es lo que era (.) un extranj-	66		trying to understand what it was (.) a foreign-
67		de entender qué es lo que es un extranjero. osea	67		to understand what it is a foreigner. I mean
68		“este tipo se crio en la <u>selva</u> ,	68		“did this guy grow up in the <u>jungle</u> ,
69		mató <u>gente</u> . @	69		kill <u>people</u> . @
70		comió <u>monos</u> ,	70		eat <u>monkeys</u> ,
71		qué hizo este tipo ah,	71		what did this guy do ah,
72		qué es lo que hace,”	72		what does he do,”
73		me entiendes,	73		you know,

74	osea para él <u>todo lo que era yo era algo</u> misterioso y como una incógnita	74	I mean to him <u>everything about me</u> was something mysterious and a sort of mystery
75	así como (.)	75	something like (.)
76	“¿qué hará,	76	”“what does he do,
77	no sé le pegará a su mujer (M:mhm)	77	I don't know does he hit his wife (M:mhm)
78	qué hará”	78	what does he do,”
79	no sé me entiendes	79	I don't know you know
80	como “qué qué cómo actuara	80	like “what what how would he react
81	qué e- qué es lo que pasará cuando yo le diga:	81	what what would happen if I tell him:
82	‘oye tienes que hacer este trabajo.’	82	‘hey you have to do this job.’
83	me pegará,” (.)	83	will he hit me,”
84	entonces es- así eran las preguntas.	84	the it was- the questions were like that.
85	era como un poco	85	it was like a bit
86	M qué te preg- qué-	86	M what did he ask- wha-
87	V entonces yo yo me empezab- yo me empecé a b- a chorear,	87	V then I I was start- I started to g- to get angry,
88	porque: la entrevista de trabajo nunca se trato del tema profesional.	88	beca:use the job interview was never about professional questions.
89	yo trataba de llevar la la la entrevista de trabajo a (.) cuál habían sido mis experiencias de trabajo,	89	I would try to lead the the the interview towards (.) my previous work experiences,
90	y el <u>siempre</u> cambiaba el tema de de la entrevista (.) hacia mi: (.) hacia mi: condición de extranjero.	90	and he would <u>always</u> change the topic of the interview back (.) to my: (.) to my status as a foreigner.
91	osea “ya. que el <u>idio:ma</u>	91	I mean “there. the <u>la:nguage</u>
92	que de dónde <u>vie:nes</u>	92	that where you <u>co:me from</u>
93	que si vas a viajar a <u>Chi:le</u>	93	that if you'll be traveling to <u>Chi:le</u>
94	que si tu familia viene <u>pa acá:</u> ”	94	that if your family comes <u>he:re</u> ”
95	osea (.) era- no tenía <u>nada que ver</u> con el trabajo mismo	95	I mean (.) it wa- it <u>had nothing to do</u> with the job itself
96	entonces <u>era todo el rato</u> era eso	96	then it was like that <u>all the time</u>
97	entonces ya al final me dijo	97	then at the end he told me
98	“bueno pero <u>ustedes</u> lo (.) los latinos tienen: tienen (1.1) ese temperamento como de:	98	“well but <u>you</u> (.) Latinos have: (1.1) that temper of li:ke
99	¿cómo fue que dijo,	99	¿what did he say,
100	entonces ahí dijo algo así como de: (.) como de <u>charro</u> o una cosa así como”	100	then there he said something like a (.) <u>charro</u> (mexican cowboy) temper or something like”
101	se imaginó un: [un cowboy] me entiendes @@	101	he pictured himself a: [a cowboy] you know @@
102	S [un macho]	102	S [a macho]
103	V entonces dijo así como (.)	103	V then he said something like (.)
104	“qué va a pasar cuando: (.) cuando quéseyo eh- (0.8)	104	“what will happen whe:n (.) when I dunow eh: (0.8)
105	si algo te molesta te vas a parar- como onda te vas xxx”	105	if something bothers you are you gonna stand- like kind of will you xxx”
106	como que el tipo lo que estaba esperando era que me-	106	like what the guy expected from me was that I-
107	además me empezó a como a- a: =	107	besides he started like to- to: =
108	S = a retar [así xxx]	108	S = to challenge [like xxx]
109	V [no no como] a retar pero como a provocar =	109	V [no no like] to challenge but to provoke =
110	S = a provocar ya	110	S = to provoke yes
111	V me estaba preo- me estaba provocando	111	V he was preo- he was provoking me
112	el tipo lo que quería era que <u>justamente</u> yo (.)	112	what the guy wanted was <u>precisely</u> that I (.)

113	para así él él además[conformarse] consigo mismo	113	so that he he would also be [happy with] himself
114	S [sí darse por xxx]	114	S [yes to be xxx]
115	V y decir	115	V and say
116	“no en realidad este tipo no (.) <u>no puede</u> <u>ser</u>	116	“no this guy actually can't (.) <u>he can't be</u>
117	porque mira como se pone chachai (M : mhm) osea- no	117	because look how he reacts see (M : mhm) I mean no
118	no soporta que yo le <u>pregunte</u> (.) ah,”	118	he can't stand that I <u>ask</u> him (.) ah,”
119	pero: (.) entonces (.)	119	but: then
120	y yo pensaba en ese momento,	120	and I was thinking in that moment,
121	yo yo pensaba hacia mis adentros.	121	I I was thinking in my head.
122	y decía (0.9)	122	and I was saying (0.9)
123	“este tipo me está preguntando sobre el <u>temperamento</u> .	123	this guy is asking me about my <u>temper</u> .
124	y yo creo <u>personalmente</u> que yo no he visto-”	124	and I <u>personally</u> believe that I haven't seen-”
125	o sea los noruegos son <u>sumamente</u> <u>temperamentales</u> .	125	I mean Norwegians have <u>strong tempers</u> .
126	osea un noruego tú no vienes a preguntarle a él	126	I mean you don't come to a Norwegian asking
127	que qué es lo que come,	127	what he eats,
128	ni que cómo hace,	128	nor how he does things,
129	ni que cómo huele,	129	nor how he smells,
130	porque el tipo va y te dice	130	because the guy would tell you
131	“qué mierda te está pasando,	131	“what the shit is wrong with you,
132	osea ubícate.	132	I mean get a grip.
133	qué me estai preguntando,”	133	what are you asking me about,”
134	osea y eso no tiene que ver con el temperamento.	134	I mean and that has nothing to do with temper.
135	eso tiene que ver con el respeto.	135	that has to do with respect.
136	que es otra cosa.	136	which is another thing.
137	osea tú si si te faltan el respeto te t- tienes que poner al otro tipo en su lugar y punto	137	I mean you if if they disrespect you you need to put the other guy in his place period
138	y y el tipo	138	and and the guy
139	el tipo estaba siendo irrespetuoso conmigo en la en la entrevista de trabajo	139	the guy was disrespecting me at the job interview
140	y el tipo lo que creía era que yo me iba a parar arriba de la <u>mesa</u> y como a ponerme a zapatear	140	and the guy thought that I was going to stand on the <u>table</u> and start stomping on it
141	una cosa así así me entiendes,	141	something like that you know,
142	eso entonces como una caricaturización de [de tu condición]	142	then that's like a caricature of [of your status...
143	S [le hubieras mandado] un puñete [y punto (.) y nada]	143	S [you should have] punched him in the face [period (.) and nothing]
144	V [claro] eso es lo que] sí	144	V [right] that's what] yes
145	S y ahí terminabas tu @	145	S and that was your end @
146	V sí. eso era	146	V yeah that was it
147	no [importaba nada de lo que]	147	no [it didn't matter any of what]
148	S [eso es lo que él quería @]	148	S [that's what he wanted @]
149	V no importaba nada de lo que	149	V it didn't matter anything of what
150	no importaba lo que yo había <u>estudia:do</u>	150	it didn't matter what I had <u>stu:died</u>
151	no importaba lo que yo había hecho nada	151	it didn't matter what I had done nothing
152	el tipo ahí estaba: como su primera experiencia con un extranjero de cierta	152	the guy was there: like (having) his first experience with a foreigner, in some way

	manera		or another
153	por olv- (.)	153	by obl- (.)
154	yo creo que el tipo nol- no la quería era-	154	I think the guy didn- didn't want it-
155	por él ojalá se hubiese s- se hubiese	155	he would've wished he could have spared
	ahorrado esa experiencia osea		himself from that experience I mean
156	yo llegue ahí <u>justamente</u> porque nunca	156	I got there <u>precisely</u> because I never ran
	me topé con él en todas las otras		into him in all the previous interviews
	entrevistas osea no- =		I mean no-=
157 M	=pero al final te te dio el trabajo	157 M	= but at the end he gave you the job...
158 V	<u>no no</u> . no me lo dio.	158 V	<u>no no</u> . he didn't give it to me.
159	no esto fue en otra empresa en una	159	no this was in another company at a
	empresa anterior		previous company
160	que que era del mismo rubro de de	160	that that was in the same business of
	TRABAJO		WORK
161	pero no ahí no quedé. (2.5)	161	but I didn't get it. (2.5)
162	llegué hasta la última ronda, pero:	162	I made it to the last (interview) round, but
163	cuando conocí al dueño capitalista de la	163	when I met the owner of the company,
	empresa,		
164	ahí ya fracasó todo. @@ ah (exhales	164	there everything failed. @@@ ah
	loudly)		(exhales loudly)

Juana B

01 **M** e: qué les voy a preguntar ahora,
 02 así e: tienen que pensar @@
 03 cuál pueden decir que ha sido la mejor
 y la peor experiencia que han tenido en
 Noruega,
 04 estoy pensando así experiencia
 05 algo que les pasó
 06 **J** pero es mas a nivel personal: e: osea
 07 o en relación a: (.) >a algo que nos haya
 sucedido<
 08 bueno nosé [un poquito] difícil.
 09 **M** [algo]
 10 algo que te que te haya sucedido o
 puede ser (.)
 11 haber visto algo o haber @ estado
 involucrado en algo lo que sea
 12 y en term- o sea la mejor y peor
 experiencia en términos muy amplios
 13 puede ser en relación a (.) cualquier
 cosa (15.4)
 14 **J** (01.03.09) pus yo no sé si hay osea
 algo- algo que digas lo- (.) lo peor
 15 no sé si sea pero: (0.6)
 16 pero sí he tenido varias experiencias en
 donde: (0.7) el el idioma (.) no, me ha
 limitado mucho,
 17 tal vez y que osea que han sido
 momentos muy molestos
 18 como por ejemplo el: día que el día que
di a luz no, @
 19 a mi hija que tuve que llamar al hospital
 para ver qué (.) qué es lo que iba: que
 iba a suceder,
 20 y me contestó una mujer que era- no era
 noruega era sueca,
 21 y me hablaba en sueco,
 22 y yo no entendía nada,
 23 y estaba con los dolores de parto, y:
 (0.6)
 24 y fue muy humillante que que m- ella
 me hablaba mal,
 25 y que: (.) no quería que- hablar con mi
 esposo, porque quería que yo le hablara
 26 pero yo no le entendía
 27 y no me tenía la paciencia no,
 28 y yo tampoco tenía
 29 no estaba n- @ de humor ni (0.8)
 30 ni nada como para para lidiar con ella
 no,
 31 eso me acuerdo mucho que fue muy
 frustrante.
 32 muy muy frustrante.
 33 que: (.) que que se da mucho por hecho
 aquí que que porque hablas noruego,
 entonces vas a entender sueco, o vas a
 entender danés (S:@) no,

01 **M** e: what am I going to ask you now,
 02 like e: you have to think @@
 03 what would you say was the best and
worst experience you have had in
 Norway
 04 I am thinking like an experience
 05 something that happened to you
 06 **J** but its like at a personal level e: I mean
 07 or in relation to: (.) >to something that
 happened to us<
 08 well I don't know [it's a bit] difficult
 09 **M** [something]
 10 something that happened to you or it can
 be (.)
 11 having seen something or having @ been
 involved in something whatever (15.4)
 12 and in relat- I mean the best and worst
 experience in very general terms
 13 it can be in relation to (.) anything (15.4)
 14 **J** (01.03.09) well I don't know if there is
 something that you would say the- (.)
the worst
 15 I don't know if it is bu:t (0.6)
 16 but I have had several experiences
 whe:re (0.7) the the language (.) right,
 has limited me a lot,
 17 maybe that I mean those have been really
 annoying situations
 18 like for example the: day I gave birth
 right, @
 19 to my daughter and I had to call the
 hospital to see what(.) what was go:ing
 what was going to happen
 20 and a woman answered who was- wasn't
 Norwegian she was Swedish,
 21 and she was speaking to me in Swedish,
 22 and I couldn't understand anything,
 23 and I was with labor pains, a:nd (0.6)
 24 and it was very humiliating that that m-
 she was speaking badly (in a bad
 manner) to me,
 25 and tha:t (.) she didn't want to talk to my
 husband, because she wanted me to talk
 to her
 26 but I couldn't understand her
 27 and she didn't have any patience right,
 28 and nor did I
 29 I wasn't n- @ in the mood nor (0.8)
 30 nor anything to to be able to deal with
 her right,
 31 that I remember well it was very
 frustrating
 32 very very frustrating.
 33 that that it is taken for granted here that
 that because you speak Norwegian then
 you'll be able to understand Swedish, or
 you will understand Danish (S: @) right,

34	y no necesariamente. no,	34	and not necessarily. right,
35	osea especialmente cuando te m:	35	I mean especially when they m: talk to
	hablan: (.)		you (over the phone) (.)
36	osea bueno ne- especialmente en un	36	I mean well especially in a moment like
	momento como ése en lo que (S:hm)		that in when (S:hm)
37	nor- lo que menos estas pensando es en	37	nor- the last thing on your mind is the
	es en el idioma en el que estás hablando		language you are speaking in right, (1.1)
	no, (1.1)		
38	y por el estilo he tenido o- otras	38	and I have had other experiences like
	experiencias no,		that right,
39	también (.)	39	also (.)
40	normalmente son por teléfono no,	40	usually over the phone right,
41	con gente que: que te: que- que se	41	with people that that that get angry
	molesta porque no los <u>entiendes</u>		because you don't <u>understand</u> them
	e:(1.35)		e:(1.35)
42	la última fue e-	42	the last one was e-
43	hablé para (.) hacer una cita unos	43	I made a call to make an appointment
	análisis en el doctor y: (.)		with the doctor for some analysis a:nd
44	y lo mismo no me creían no, que tenía	44	and the same they didn't believe me
	una hoja que me había dado el medico		right, that I had a paper that the doctor
			had given me
45	y querían que que mi esposo hablara	45	and they wanted my husband to talk to
	con ellos. no,		them right,
46	porque normalmente osea “no no es que	46	because normally I mean “no no I can't
	no le entiendo “		understand you
47	no, y bueno dije “por el amor de dios	47	right, y well I said for the love of god I
	osea (S:@)		mean (S:@)
48	yo digo voy a la universidad y-	48	I say I attend the university and-
49	>y cómo no me puede entender le estoy	49	>and how can you not understand what I
	diciendo <		am saying<
50	osea le estoy pidiendo una <u>cita</u> ”	50	I mean I am asking for an <u>appointment</u> ”
51	“no no pero es que este: no-” osea	51	“no no but is that no-” I mean
52	mi esposo tuvo que hablar al final de	52	my husband had to talk at the end
	cuentas		
53	y eso fue hace dos días no,	53	and this was two days ago right,
54	entonces por eso también lo tengo muy	54	then this is also why I have it quite
	reciente.		present
55	pero eso es de lo más molesto no,	55	but that is the most annoying thing right,
56	que cuando la gente te trata (.) así	56	that when people treat you (.) like that
57	osea que cuando te sient-	57	I mean when you feel-
58	cuando te hablan como un niño no,	58	when they talk to you like a child right,
59	porque eso es algo xxx que me molesta	59	because that is something xxx that
	mucho,		bothers me a lot
60	que que te hablen como si tuvieras	60	that they talk to you as if you were five
	cinco años		years old
61	que te hablen así todo <u>le:nto</u> y todo	61	that they talk to you all <u>slo:wly</u> and all
62	porque n- porque eres extranjero, (.)	62	because n- you are a foreigner, (.)
63	o cuando te tratan mal porque no-	63	or when they treat you badly because
	porque no los entiendes no,		you can't understand them right,
64	y realmente no es tu culpa (.)	64	and it's really not your fault (.)
65	no es tu - (.) osea	65	it is not your - (.) I mean
66	que hay muchos otros factores que que	66	that there are many other factors that that
	influyen en ese momento		influence in that moment
67	eso es de lo peor no, (S: hm)	67	that's the worst right, (S: hm)
68	y lo mejor pues no sé (.)	68	and the best I don't know (.)
69	déjame pensar @ (M:@)	69	let me think @ (M:@)
	(15.6)		(15.6)

Susana B

70	S	(01.06.05) no sé lo mejor de repente fue	70	S	(01.06.05) I don't know the best
		que: (2.1)			(experience) was maybe that (2.14)

71	aparte de conocer a mi novio. @ (1.1)	71	besides meeting my boyfriend. @ (1.1)
72	e fue conseguir trabajo, (0.7) e: (1.1)	72	e it was finding a job, (0.7) e: (1.16)
73	porque bueno la prime:ra ya	73	because when the fi:rst one well
74	eso creo de repente fue la <u>peor</u>	74	I think that was probably the <u>worst</u>
	experiencia que tuve		experience I had
75	fue que fui a una entrevista de trabajo,	75	it was that I was at a job interview,
76	y había tenido nada más que cinco	76	and I had been studying Norwegian for
	meses estudiando noruego, (.) (clears		only five months, (.) (clears her voice)
	her voice) y:e: (1.6)		a:nd e: (1.6)
77	fue una entr-evista con la directora y	77	it was an interview with the principal and
	otra profesora de de un jardín de niños		another teacher at a preschool
78	entonces estaba la directora y otras dos	78	then there was the principal and two three
	tres profesoras más		other teachers
79	>no me acuerdo<	79	>I don't remember<
80	entonces me sentí así como que: (.) <u>en</u>	80	then I felt like: (.) <u>on the spot</u> in front of
	<u>la mira</u> de muchos (1.1)		many people (1.1)
81	empezó ahí a preguntarme -	81	there she started asking me -
82	a hacerme muchas preguntas,	82	asking a lot of questions,
83	y me empezó a preguntar (.) “del	83	and started asking about (.) “the Peruvian
	sistema educativo peruano		educational system
84	cómo era,	84	how it was,
85	y en relación al noruego,”	85	and in relation to the Norwegian,”
86	osea yo tenía <u>cinco meses</u> estudiando	86	I mean I had been studying Norwegian for
	noruego (.)		<u>five months</u> (.)
87	me había aprendido las <u>supuestas</u>	87	I had learned all the <u>typical</u> questions,
	preguntas, (V: mh @)		(V: mh@)
88	y me sale preguntando sobre “el sistema	88	and there she starts asking about “the
	educativo peruano,		Peruvian educational system,
89	y que lo traduzca,	89	and that I should translate it,
90	y no sé qué.” (0.7)	90	and that.” (.)
91	y este: (.)	91	and e: (.)
92	y lo de dije que: (.)	92	and I said tha:t (.)
93	<u>ah</u> ella misma me dijo creo,	93	<u>oh</u> she herself told me I think,
94	“puedes hablar inglés si es que tu	94	“you can speak in English if you want.”
	quieres.”		
95	y yo le dije “ok” entonces lo expliqué	95	and I said “OK” then I explained it in
	en inglés,		English,
96	y de ahí agarró y me dijo:	96	and there she said to me
97	“la verdad que tu nivel de noruego está	97	“well your Norwegian level is rea:lly- (.)
	muy:- (.) bajo,		low,
98	y muy mal que hablaste inglés.”	98	and it was really bad that you spoke in
			English.”
99	y yo “pero es que tú me dijiste que	99	and I “but you told me to speak in
	hable inglés”-		English”-
100	entonces (1.4) yo sabía también de que	100	then (1.4) I knew that I had been
	tenía muy poco tiempo e: hablando		speaking Norwegian for a short time. (.)
	noruego. (.)		
101	* pero dije “bueno igual me lanzo”	101	*but I said “well I'll just give it a go”
	verdad,		right,
102 V	claro	102 V	sure
103 S	pero: me trato <u>tan mal</u> ,	103 S	bu:t she treated me <u>so badly</u> ,
104	y me hizo sentir <u>tan horrible</u> ,	104	and she made me feel <u>so awful</u> ,
105	(V: exhales) que <u>salí: llora:ndo ese día</u>	105	(V:exhales) that <u>I left cry:ing that day</u>
106	y había una tormenta <u>de nie:ve</u>	106	and there was a <u>sno:w</u> storm
107	y yo dije (V: @) “qué <u>mierda</u> hago yo	107	and I said (V:@) “what the <u>fuck</u> am I
	en este país” @@@		doing in this country” @@@
108	y de regreso la nieve caía en la cara	108	and on the way back home the snow
	(mimes with hands on her face)		falling on my face (mimes with hands on
			her face)
109	y yo así “ahh” lloraba @@	109	and I was like “ ah” crying @@

110	y ese día no fui a la escuela me acuerdo (M: mhm)	110	and that day I didn't go to (Norwegian) school I remember (M:mhm)
111	y este: fue horrible.	111	and e: it was awful.
112	ese sí- ese día si dije “no ya”	112	that ye- that day I said “that's enough”
113	y este: e- (0.7)	113	and e: e- (0.7)
114	y la siguiente entrevista que tuve, (0.7)	114	and the next interview that I had, (0.7)
115	me preparé mucho más,	115	I prepared myself much better,
116	traduje todo el: el sistema peruano en noruego, @	116	I translated the whole Peruvian education system to Norwegian, @
117	hice un power point,	117	I made a power point (presentation),
118	osea no sabes cómo me preparé (M: @)	118	I mean you have no idea how well I prepared myself (M:@)
119	nunca me había prepar- <u>ni en Perú</u> tanto (.)	119	I had never prepar- <u>not even in Peru</u> so much (.)
120	y dije “no esta vez sí” y:	120	and I said “no, this time yes” a:nd
121	bueno (.) osea caí e en un sitio donde necesitaban a alguien, <u>realmente</u> osea.	121	well (.) I mean I landed at a place where they <u>really</u> needed someone, I mean.
122	no fue <u>tan</u> difícil la entrevista como la otra	122	it wasn't <u>so</u> difficult the interview as the other one
123 V	ya	123 V	yeah
124 S	la otra creo que el nivel era más alto en realidad también osea	124 S	the other (interview) I think that there was a higher lever actually I mean
125	el nivel <u>profesional</u> era alto,	125	there was a high <u>professional</u> level,
126	en el otro lado exigían más que en el- (.) donde yo entré. (inhalés)	126	at the other place they demanded more than where I got in. (inhalés)
127	no y creo que el power point me <u>salvó</u> al final.	127	no and I think that the power point <u>saved</u> me at the end.
128	porque: este yo le enseñé -	128	beca:use e I showed it -
129	obviamente no me pidieron.	129	they obviously didn't ask me to do it.
130	pero dije “ah bueno he. he hecho esto	130	but I said “oh well and I ha:ve have made this
131	y les quiero enseñar para que vean como se trabaja en Perú.” y ya (.)	131	I want to show you so that you can see how we work in Peru.” and there (.)
132	y me dijeron “qué- ”	132	and they told me “what-”
133	osea eran cuatro señoras de cincuenta o sesenta años en la entrevista, <u>tres tres</u>	133	I mean they were four ladies between fifty or sixty years old at the interview, <u>three three</u>
134	y este me dijeron “qué puedes hacer esas cosas en la computadora,” (V: @)	134	and em: they said “can you make those things with the computer,” (V:@)
135	y yo “sí”	135	and I “yes”
136	“no: porque nosotras tenemos computadora	136	“no: because we have a computer (here)
137	y no podemos hacer nada (claps)” (V:@)	137	and we can't do any of those things (claps)” (V:@)
138	entonces este:	138	then em:
139	tú nunca sabes qué te va a salvar en una entrevista.	139	you never know what will save you at an interview.
140	asique yo creo que eso me salvó @ @ @	140	so I think that that saved me @ @ @
141	y de ahí me llamaron,	141	and there they called me,
142	y de ahí me dijeron este:	142	and they said em:
143	la directora me dijo que “bueno que	143	the principal told me that “well that
144	que le prometa que iba a seguir estudiando noruego” <u>obviamente</u> (.)	144	that I promised her that I would continue with Norwegian courses” <u>obviously</u> (.)
145	y yo “te lo prometo” @ @	145	and I “I promise you” @ @
146	y este ya (.) osea	146	and em: yeah (.) I mean
147	pero creo que eso fue lo que me salvó en realidad	147	but I think that that was what saved me actually
148	y ahí estaba súper feliz pues no xxx mhm @ @ (4.5)	148	and there I was very happy well xxx mhm @ @ (4.5)

Victor C

149	V	yo el más malo más bueno no sé.	149	V	the best and worst well I don't know
150		no me acuerdo realmente no:	150		I don't remember really no:
151		no sabría decirte.=	151		I wouldn't know what to say
152	M	bueno no el más malo	152	M	Well no the worst
153		no tiene que ser el absoluto más malo @	153		it doesn't have to be the absolute worse @
154		puede ser <u>uno</u> malo @@	154		it can be a <u>bad</u> one
155	V	sí: puede ser a ver (5.8)	155	V	yeah it can be let me see (5.8)
156		momentos malos pueden ser e: (3)	156		bad moments can be s: (3)
157		>que se yo< (4.1)	157		>Idon'tknow<
158		en relación como a: mi: (2.5)	158		in relation to me to my: (2.5)
159		a los problemas que nos causo a mí y a Violeta,	159		to the problems it caused us to Violeta and me,
160		como pareja estar acá,	160		as a couple to be here,
161		yo creo que eso ha sido como lo más malo en el principio. (.)	161		I think that that has been the worst in the beginning. (.)
162		o los problemas de que yo no tenía trabajo,	162		or the problems that I didn't have a job,
163		que ella tenía que tramitar lo- (.) su pasaporto,	163		that she had to present the- (.) her passport,
164		que ella: estaba de ilegal,	164		that she: was illegal
165		un montón de cosas de ese tipo fueron-	165		a lot of stuff like that was -
166		creo que eso fue lo- lo más malo en cosas personales en ese sentido. (2)	166		I think that was the- the worst in like personal stuff in that sense. (2)
167		y: después ya están todos esos casos que >que se yo<	167		and then there's all those cases when >I don'tknow<
168		te tratan mal, que te: (.)	168		they treat you badly that they: (.)
169	M	sólo si eliges uno para contarlos nomás. si te acuerdas	169	M	if you just pick one to tell. if you remember
170	V	(01.10.50) sí puede ser uno en que fui a: a solicitar trabajo al-	170	V	(01.10.50) yes it could be one when I was applying for a job-
171		una de las tantas veces que yo he ido a solicitar trabajo @	171		one of the many times that I have applied for a job @
172		fui al @ al NSB a solicitar trabajo para ser conductor, (1.3)	172		I went @ to NSB (Norwegian railways) to apply for a job as a train conductor, (1.3)
173		o <i>billettkontrolør</i> era (0.7)	173		or was it <i>billettkontrolør</i> (ticket officer) (0.7)
174		°controlador de billetes y e-	174		°ticket officer and e-
175		y ahí entonces (2.7)	175		and there then (2.7)
176		resultó que eramos: (.) diez personas. en una mesa. (.)	176		it turned out be that we were (.) then people. sitting around a table. (.)
177		todos eramos solicitantes del trabajo.	177		we were all applying to that job.
178		y entonces llegan tres personas de NSB,	178		and then three representatives of NSB arrive,
179		y empiezan a presentar un power point de la empresa,	179		and they start showing a power point about the company,
180		en donde empiezan a mostrar cuales son los valores de la empresa,	180		where they show the values of the company,
181		que es lo que ellos consideran mas importante y toda la cuestión.	181		what they consider is the most important and all that.
182		>°ahí yo sabía re poco noruego realmente en esa época< (0.8)	182		>°and at that time I could speak very little Norwegian truly< (0.8)
183		<u>sabía un poco</u> pero: (1.5) poco. @	183		I knew a bit but (1.5) just a bit. @
184		de todas maneras y: (2.2)	184		anyways and (2.2)
185		y entonces después van y empiezan a hacer un tipo de preguntas ,	185		and then they start asking some questions (to a guy),
186		y: entonces le dicen	186		and then they say to him
187		“bueno que es lo que consideras <u>tú</u> -	187		“well what do <u>you</u> consider-

188	osea por qué crees <u>tú</u> (.) que que tú tienes que conseguir este trabajo en <i>NSB</i> ”	188	I mean why do <u>you</u> (.) think that you should get this position at <i>NSB</i> ”
189	y parten por el lado de la derecha ,	189	and they start (asking this question to the round of people) by the right side,
190	y yo era el penúltimo en el lado izquierda. (.)	190	and I was next to last to the left. (.)
191	y eran <u>puros</u> noruegos	191	and they were <u>all</u> Norwegians
192	entonces todos contestan pero:	192	then all of them answer bu:t
193	el primero <u>contesto tanto</u> , @ que hasta incluso el resto de los noruegos se puso: nervioso, (S: mhm)	193	the first one had <u>answered so much</u> , @ that even the other Norwegians go:t nervous, (S: mhm)
194	osea el tipo consig-	194	I mean the guy got-
195	el tipo se consiguió el trabajo <u>al tiro</u>	195	they guy got the job <u>right away</u>
196	te lo digo <u>al tiro</u>	196	I'm telling you <u>right away</u>
197	y yo de hecho yo lo vi después sentado en <i>NSB</i> trabajando @@ (M:@)	197	and I as a matter of fact I saw him afterwards sitting at <i>NSB</i> working @@ (M: @)
198	y: (.) y mientras iba avanzando entonces las preguntas,	198	a:nd (.) and as they were moving forward with the questions,
199	yo iba pensando “en que-“	199	then I was thinking “what-”
200	osea porque si yo quería el trabajo,	200	I mean because if I wanted the job,
201	yo tenía que contestar un-	201	I had to answer a-
202	tenía que aportar en algo.	202	I had to come with something (to say).
203	tenía que decir algo nuevo. me entiendes,	203	I had to say something new. you know,
204	era como “si repito lo mismo es como [uuuu es como]”	204	it was like “if I repeat the same is like [uuuu: is like]”
205 S	[u: te copiaste] @@	205	S: [uh: you cheated] @@
206 V	eh como ya e incluso el noruego, ya no sabían qué más decir .	206	V: eh like then even the Norwegian, they didn't know what else to say.
207	porque el tipo había hablado tanto, el primero,	207	because that guy had spoken so much, the first one,
208	no había- no había absolutamente nada más que decir.	208	there wasn't- there was absolutely nothing more to say.
209	y mi noruego era tan básico, que tampoco-	209	and my Norwegian was so basic, that neither-
210	yo- pensaba en español, y decía,	210	and I was thinking in Spanish and saying
211	“bueno y cómo [cresta] =	211	“well and how [the heck] =
212 S	[xxx demonios]	212	S: [xxx damn]
213 V	= digo esto,”	213	V: = do I say this,”
214	osea “cómo cómo les digo,	214	I mean “how do I tell them,
215	qué qué hago,”	215	what what shall I do,”
216	y: y cuando me llegó mi turno, no supe qué decir. @	216	a:nd and when my turn arrived, I didn't know what to say. @
217	y no: y me puse a tartamudear-	217	and no: and I started stuttering-
218	y jamás en mi vida había tartamudeado.	218	and never before in my life had I stuttered.
219	y no pude hablar,	219	I couldn't speak,
220	si- simplemente no me salió <u>una</u> palabra.	220	simply not even <u>one</u> single word came out.
221	no me salió nada.	221	nothing came out.
222	no me salió nada. (1)	222	nothing came out. (1)
223	absolutamente <u>nada</u> .	223	absolutely <u>nothing</u> .
224	nada nada nada nada nada	224	nothing nothing nothing nothing nothing
225	y todo el mundo me estaba mirando,	225	and everyone was looking at me,
226	todo el mundo estaba esperando que yo contestara,	226	everyone was waiting for me to answer,
227	(inhales) y como un calor insoportable en el cuerpo	227	(inhales) and like an unbearable heat in my body

228	y: tomando agua	228	a:nd drinking water
229	y no- no no sabía qué decir	229	and no- I didn't know what to say
230	no sabía decir (1.1)	230	I didn't know to say (1.1)
231	no sabía si pararme o irme	231	I didn't know if I should stand up and leave
232	no sabía si decir perdón	232	I didn't know if I should say sorry
233	no sabía:	233	I didn't know
234	no sabía <u>qué cara</u> poner tampoco	234	I didn't know <u>what kind of face</u> I should bear
235	era como (1.3) ahg	235	it was like (1.3) ahg
236	fue <u>realmente</u> una situación (.) que <u>jamás</u> no me había pasado ni en el <u>colegio</u> ni en el <u>jardín</u> n -	236	it was <u>truly</u> a situation (.) that had <u>never</u> happened to me neither at <u>school</u> nor <u>kindergarden</u> nor-
237	no me acuerdo alguna vez en que me hubiese puesto <u>tan</u> :	237	I can't remember any time where I had been <u>so</u> :
238	nosé quizás solamente: cuand- la primera vez que le dije a una mujer que la que la quería o que la amaba quizás me puse tan nervioso @@	238	Idunno maybe ju:st whe- the first time that I said to a woman that I cared about her or that I loved her I was maybe that nervous @@
239	pero yo creo que j- antes, no había s-	239	but I think that n- before, I haven't f-
240	nunca había estado tan tímido ni tan ni me había sentido tan impotente como esa vez. (1.6)	240	I had never been so shy nor so nor had I felt so powerless like that time. (1.6)
241	después cuando salí fue como	241	then when I left it was like
242	ya primero fue como achacante,	242	yeah first it was like sad,
243	pero después en el bus ya después ya me-	243	but then in the bus afterwards I was-
244	en el <i>trikk</i> ya después ya me reía	244	in the <i>trikk</i> (tram) afterwards I was already laughing
245	porque decía "pero qué mierd-"	245	because I was saying "but what the shit-"
246	o sea yo me preguntaba qué me pasó, osea	246	I mean I was asking my self what had happened to me, I mean
247	nunca:	247	neve:r
248	me me desconocí <u>completamente</u>	248	I was <u>acomplete</u> stranger to myself
249	no me había pasado jamás algo así que me había puesto tan como tímido o nervioso o tímido una cosa así como	249	it had never happened anything like that that I had been so shy- or nervous or shy or something like
250	°chuta "qué horrible" dije pero:	250	°shit "how awful" I said bu:t
251	después me reía y dije	251	afterwards I was laughing and said
252	"ya. después de esto ya no hay nada peor @@	252	"now. after this there is nothing worse @@
253	no hay nada peor" asique	253	there is nothing worse" so
254	después de eso ya las entrevistas de trabajo ya después ya era como:	254	after that job interview then after were like:
255	ya. qué venga (aplaude) @@	255	yeah bring it on (claps) @@
256	y hubo otras también así <u>malas</u> eh	256	and there were other <u>bad</u> ones like that eh
257	hubo otra em con fly-en el <i>flytoget</i> también e fue así como:	257	there was another one em- at the <i>flytoget</i> (airport train) too e it was li:ke
258	sí era un poco así como un <u>reality show</u> casi	258	it was a bit like <u>reality tv show</u> almost
259	como que nos hacían presen- (.) ponernos adelante en un <u>escena:rio</u> ,	259	like they made us presen- (.) stand in front on a <u>sta:ge</u> ,
260	y teníamos que presentarnos en <u>inglé:s</u>	260	and we had to present ourselves in <u>E:nglish</u>
261	y habían ya no eran tres sino que eran <u>cinco</u> : personas de <i>flytoget</i> que estaban como controlando como tú te presentabas qué:	261	and there were not just three but <u>fi:ve</u> people representing <i>flytoget</i> that were checking how you presented yourself wha:t

262	si eras como <u>diverti:do</u> (chasquea los dedos)	262	if you were <u>fu:n</u> (claps with the fingers)
263	si eras como <u>se:rio</u> (.)	263	if you were <u>se:rious</u> (.)
264	S ° tanta cosa para [el <i>flytoget</i> , @]	264	S ° such a fuss for [<i>flytoget</i> @]
265	V [y éramos como veinte]	265	V [and we were like twenty]
266	éramos como veintitantos eh,	266	we were like twenty something ah,
267	éramos como veintitantos las personas que estaban solicitando trabajo. (1.5)	267	we were like twenty something people applying for that job. (1.5)
268	y ahí había que (1.3)	268	and there you had to (1.3)
269	era así un verdadero: (1)	269	so it was like a rea:l (1)
270	una competencia. (.)	270	a contest. (.)
271	° entonces como que eso	271	° then like that
272	han sido como situaciones en las que uno se pone- (.)	272	those have been situations where you get - (.)
273	yo creo que eso es <u>difícil para cualquiera</u> (M: mhm)	273	I think that that is <u>difficult for anyone</u> (M: mhm)
274	pero cuando uno más encima no no domina bien el idio:ma, (1.5) entonces	274	but when you on top of that don't know the language, (1.5) very well then
275	es p- no sé si es casi peor o no pero:	275	es p- I don't know if it is even worse or not
276	yo en Chile no m- no: simplemente no lo habría hecho quizás. me entiendes,	276	me in Chile no m- no: I would have probably not done it. you know,
277	“ <u>ah</u> . esto que es esta huevada,” osea	277	“ <u>ah</u> what is this shit,” I mean
278	y me voy- me doy la medial vuelta y me voy (1.1)	278	I leave- I turn around and leave (1.1)
279	“no estoy <u>dispuesto a esto</u> ” me entiendes, (M: mhm)	279	“I am not <u>willing to do this</u> ” you know, (I: mhm)
280	pero acá uno esta dispuesto a <u>tantas cosas</u> (S: mhm) (2.14)	280	but here one is willing to do <u>so many things</u> (S: mhm) (2.14)
281	y: momentos buenos entonces,	281	and good moments then,
282	han sido quizá lo contrario.	282	have been the opposite.
283	momentos en que me han dicho “sí tienes el trabajo”	283	moments when they have said to me “yes you have the job”
284	han han sido <u>muy buenos</u> momentos @@	284	those have been <u>very good</u> moments @@
285	>que se yo<	285	>Idon'tknow<
286	momentos en que te reconocen que lo que estás haciendo es <u>bue:no</u> ,	286	moments when they recognize that what you are doing is <u>goo:d</u>
287	momentos en el que: alguien llama para <u>felicita:rte</u> , como que te: (4.14)	287	moments whe:n someone calls to <u>congra:tulate</u> you like that (4.14)
288	yo diría como:	288	I would say li:ke
289	me- me estoy refiriendo com oen relación a los noruegos. no, (mhm)	289	I am talking about like in relation to Norwegians. right, (mhm)
290	porque a nivel personal, también >que se yo<	290	because on the personal level, too >Idon'tknow<
291	cuando nació mi hi:ja,	291	when my daughter was born
292	>ha sido- está lleno de momentos buenos<	292	>has been- it's full of good moments<
293	pero como en relación a la sociedad noruega, (mhm)	293	but like in relation to Norwegian society, (mhm)
294	yo creo que eso.	294	I think that.
295	momentos en el que uno: (1.1) consigue como en- entrar un poco más a la sociedad noruega,	295	moments when one: (1.1) manages to get a bit more into the Norwegian society,
296	y por ultimo ganarte tu plata,	296	and ultimately make your own money,
297	trabajar en lo que tú sabes y:	297	working with what you know a:nd
298	más después <u>encima</u> que haciendo eso te lo reconozcan,	298	<u>on top of that</u> to then get recognition doing that,
299	eso han sido buenos momentos.	299	those have been good moments.

Appendix B

Questions for focus group

Personal

Nombre, edad, país de origen

¿Cuál es tu educación?

¿Qué tipo de trabajos tenías en tu país?

¿Qué tipo de trabajo tenés ahora?

¿Con quién vivís?

Perfil lingüístico

¿Cuán seguido hablas noruego?

¿Y español?

¿Cuán bien dirías que hablás Noruego?

¿Dirías que sos bilingüe?

Curso de Noruego

¿Fuiste a clases de noruego?

¿Cómo fue tu primer día?

¿Hiciste amigos durante el curso?

¿Tuviste alguna pelea o conflicto?

¿Por qué? ¿Qué pasó?

Inmigración

¿Cuándo viniste a Noruega?

¿Por qué viniste a Noruega?

¿Cuál fue el contraste más grande entre tu país y Noruega?

¿Qué experiencia del primer tiempo en Noruega te afectó más?

Vida Noruega

¿Te gusta vivir en Noruega?

¿Planeas quedarte acá?

¿Cómo es tu barrio?

¿Cómo es tu relación con los noruegos?

¿Cómo creés que ellos te ven? Como latino/a, peruano, mexicano, chileno, inmigrante...

¿Qué es lo que más extrañas de la vida en tu país?

¿Cuál fue tu mejor y peor experiencia en Noruega?

Red

¿Tenés contacto con gente de tu país?

¿Dónde? En el trabajo, la universidad, etc.

¿Vas de visita a tu país?

¿Tenés contacto con otros latinoamericanos?

¿Qué dirías acerca de la manera en la que hablás español en Noruega?

¿Es diferente de como hablás en tu país? ¿Por qué?

Personal

Name, age, country of origin

What is your education?

What kind of jobs did you have in your country?

What kind of job do you have now?

How/with whom do you live?

Linguistic profile

How often do you speak Norwegian?

and Spanish?

How well would you say you speak Norwegian?

Would you say that you are bilingual?

Norwegian courses

Did you attend Norwegian classes?

How was the first day?

Did you make friends during the course?

Did you have any conflicts there?

Why? What happened?

Immigration

When did you come to Norway?

Why did you come to Norway?

What was the biggest contrast between your country and Norway?

What experience from your first time in Norway affected you the most?

Norwegian life

Do you like living in Norway?

Do you plan on staying here?

How is your neighborhood?

How is your relation to Norwegians?

How do you think they see you? As a Latino, Peruvian, Mexican, Chilean, immigrant...

What do you miss the most from your old life in your home country?

What was your best and worst experience in Norway?

Network

Do you have contact with people from your country?

Where? At work, university, etc

Do you visit home?

Are you in contact with other Latin Americans?

What would you say about the way you speak Spanish in Norway?

Is it different from how you speak in your country? Why?

Appendix C

Information letter on the project:

Lingvistisk studie i forbindelse med masteroppgave ved Universitetet i Oslo

Jeg er mastergrad student i lingvistikk ved Universitetet i Oslo og holder nå på med den avsluttende masteroppgaven. Temaet for oppgaven er språkbruk og identitet blant innvandrere, og jeg skal undersøke hvordan latinamerikanske innvandrere presenterer seg selv i sin språkbruk. Jeg er interessert i å finne ut hvordan latinamerikanerne reflekterer over sine erfaringer og hvordan disse blir presentert gjennom muntlig formidling.

For å finne ut av dette, ønsker jeg å samle fokusgrupper med tre eller fire personer. Deltakerne skal ha kommet fra Latin-Amerika til Norge som voksne og ikke ha bodd i landet lengre enn i ti år.

Spørsmålene vil dreie seg om erfaringene de har hatt som innvandrere i Norge, hvordan det var å flytte hit, hvorfor de kom, etc. Jeg vil også spørre om personlig informasjon som, utdanning, fødselssted, osv.

Jeg vil bruke båndopptaker mens vi snakker sammen og opptaket skal bli transkribert etterpå. Det er selve transkripsjonen som konstituerer data til studiet og ikke opptaket. Intervjuet vil ta omtrent en og en halv time, og vi blir sammen enige om tid og sted.

Det er frivillig å være med og du har mulighet til å trekke deg når som helst underveis, uten å måtte begrunne dette nærmere. Dersom du trekker deg vil alle innsamlede data om deg bli slettet. Opplysningene vil bli behandlet konfidensielt, dvs. at alt av personlig informasjon som gjør deltakerne gjenkjennelige vil bli slettet, utelatt eller manipulert så ingen enkeltpersoner vil kunne kjenne seg igjen i den ferdige oppgaven. Opplysningene anonymiseres. Oppgaven planlegges ferdig innen mai 2011.

Hvis det er noe du lurer på kan du ringe meg på [redacted] eller sende en e-post til [redacted]. Du kan også kontakte min veileder Elizabeth Lanza ved institutt for lingvistikk og nordiske studier på telefonnummer [redacted] eller e-post [redacted].

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste A/S.

Med vennlig hilsen

Verónica A. Pájaro

[redacted]

Appendix D

Informed consent letter

SAMTYKKEERKLÆRING VED INNSAMLING OG BRUK AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER TIL FORSKNINGSFORMÅL

PROSJEKTLEDER: Professor Elizabeth Lanza
Mastergradstudent Verónica Pájaro

PROSJEKTITTEL: "Categorization as an identity construction strategy: analyzing identity in Latin American-immigrants narratives in Oslo"

FORMÅL: Prosjektet går ut på å studere hvordan identitet konstrueres i fortellinger fra latinamerikanske innvandrere i Oslo. Vi er interessert i å se hvordan deltakere bruker gruppe kategorier i fortellinger for å presentere seg selv.

Jeg samtykker i at opplysninger om meg innhentet fra gruppe-intervju arrangert i november 2008, kan oppbevares etter prosjektavslutning ved en institusjon som er godkjent av Datatilsynet, for slik lagring.

Jeg samtykker videre i at de innsamlete opplysninger kan brukes i en etterundersøkelse av den samme forsker som er ansvarlig for prosjektet og innsamlingen av opplysningene.

Hvis det skulle være aktuelt med bruk av personopplussningene i en annen undersøkelse, vil dette kunne skje uten samtykke fra Datatilsynet.

Jeg er også kjent med at deltakelse i prosjektet er frivillig, og at jeg når som helst kan be om å få slettet de opplysninger som er registrert om meg. Dette gjelder også etter at prosjektet er avsluttet.

Sted:

Dato:

Underskrift: